

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1942

(Legislative day of Friday, February 13, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, Thou only companion of man's soul, who didst condescend to walk this way with us, assuring us thereby of heaven's friendship and Thy watchful, shepherding care: Our hearts turn wistfully to Thee, that in these days of preparation, so necessary for each one of us, we may feel the tenderness of Thy compassion, the long-suffering of Thy love, despite our oft-delayed repentance, which in the Psalmist's words we now offer from each individual heart:

Have mercy upon me, O God, after Thy great goodness; according to the multitude of Thy mercies do away mine offences.

Wash me thoroughly from my wickedness, and cleanse me from my sin.

For I acknowledge my faults, and my sin is ever before me.

Against Thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight; that Thou mightest be justified in Thy saying, and clear when Thou shalt judge.

But, lo, Thou requirest truth in the inward parts, and shall make me to understand wisdom secretly.

Thou shalt purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.

Turn Thy face from my sins, and put out all my misdeeds.

Make me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from Thy presence, and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me.

O give me the comfort of Thy help again, and establish me with Thy free Spirit.

Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord, and my tongue shall sing of Thy righteousness, and then shall my mouth show forth Thy praise. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. World without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, February 18, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The following message was received from the House of Representatives during the recess of the Senate:

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 268. An act for the relief of James Wood;

H. R. 2712. An act for the relief of the Branchland Pipe & Supply Co.;

H. R. 2780. An act for the relief of O. C. Ousley; and

H. R. 4537. An act for the relief of H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard, and J. M. Creech.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 793. An act for the relief of Marie V. Talbert and her sons James Osborn Talbert and Dewey Talbert; and

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Hiram O. Lester, Grace D. Lester, and Florence E. Dawson.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3141. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder; and

H. R. 4622. An act for the relief of Catherine Schultze.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to

By Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6621. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain aliens having sons or daughters in the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 6622. A bill to provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6623. A bill to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6624. A bill to provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 6625. A bill granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6626. A bill to grant pensions to certain World War veterans 64 years of age or over; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VORYS of Ohio:

H. R. 6627. A bill to incorporate the Postal Ex-Service Men's Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6628. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6632. A bill to penalize the divulging of the contents of confidential Government documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 6629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Layman and Dorothy J. Layman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 6630. A bill for the relief of the Waldrop Heating & Plumbing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6631. A bill for the relief of Curtis Pope; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2452. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the grand jury of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif., urging the Attorney General and Department of Justice to immediately find means to evacuate all alien Japanese from the Pacific coast area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2453. Also, petition of the Highland Park Christian Church, of Highland Park, Calif., requesting the President of the United States, as a protective measure insuring food essentials, to eliminate the manufacture of alcohol during the emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ANSEL WOLD

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in times such as these, when loyal and conscientious service is of such paramount importance to the welfare of our Nation, it is only proper that we take a few minutes now to congratulate a man who has always given that kind of service.

Forty years ago this morning, on February 19, 1902, Ansel Wold accepted a position as clerk in the Senate Document Room. He was brought here by that great Viking from Minnesota, Knute Nelson. In the years between, many Senators have come and gone, while Ansel has worked continuously for and with the United States Senate.

In the month of May 1902, he transferred from the Document Room to the office of the Secretary of the Senate, where he remained until 1910. In February of that year he was appointed printing clerk of the Senate, which position he held until April 20, 1921, when he was unanimously elected clerk to the Joint Committee on Printing. For almost 21 years he has industriously performed the difficult and technical tasks of that office.

Other Senators may not know Ansel Wold as well as I do; but I am sure that if they have done any business with him, they cannot fail to recognize and appreciate his ability, intelligence, and devotion to duty.

Ansel Wold is the compiler of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress from 1774 to 1927. That is a monumental work, in constant demand in libraries and in the offices and work-rooms of great newspapers of the United States. It contains the biographies of over 9,000 men who have served in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. The present edition was printed in 1928. Since that time more than 2,000 men have served in the two bodies. We all hope Ansel will be with us until that great work may be brought down to date.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to concur in what has been said by the able Senator from Arizona in commendation of the long and faithful public service of Ansel Wold, the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate num-

bered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Civilian Defense: To enable the Director of Civilian Defense, under such regulations as the President may prescribe (which regulations may provide exemption from the requirements of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes), to carry out the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, and for other purposes', approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 415), fiscal year 1942, \$100,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943, of which not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses, including printing and binding and personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any person in the Office of Civilian Defense unless such person is directly employed in the administration of such Act of January 27, 1942: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein may be used for the employment of persons, the rent of facilities or the purchase of equipment and supplies to promote, produce or carry on instruction or to direct instruction in physical fitness by dancers, fan dancing, street shows, theatrical performances or other public entertainments: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of \$4,500 per annum or more unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Director of Civilian Defense shall transmit to the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives every sixty days following the date of the enactment of this Act, a report in summary and by categories of the progress of the procurement of equipment and material provided by this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of any person especially employed by a contractor to solicit or secure a contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$253,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$106,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether the amendment adopted by the Senate with regard to the superintendent of the folding room was agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK, HUNTSVILLE, TEX.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration from July 1, 1939, through June 30, 1940, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of The National Archives (Division of Navy Department), and the Government Printing Office, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Tsungani Piston Co., signed by N. J. Buren, manager, Tacoma, Wash., praying for repeal of the act granting the retirement privilege to Members of Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. REED:

A resolution adopted by the Associated Industries of Kansas, assembled in annual meeting at Topeka, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 5993, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the mayor and council of Cumberland, Md., protesting against the proposal to impose a Federal tax upon State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the proposal for mandatory joint income-tax returns by husband and wife; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

The petition of members of the American Legion Auxiliary Unit of Post, No. 13, department of Kansas, of Yates Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 4) to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF STOCKHOLDERS OF MARSHALL COUNTY (KANS.) NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION—INTEREST RATES ON FARM MORTGAGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Marshall County (Kans.) National Farm Loan Association at its annual meeting at Marysville, Kans., February 5, 1942, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Briefly, the resolution asks that the present interest rate of 3½ percent on Federal land-bank and land-bank commissioner loans be extended another 3 years beyond July 1942, when the law providing the 3½-percent rate expires.

Unless Congress approves such extension, the basic rate of 5 percent on farm loans will again go into effect. Personally, I am in favor of reducing the rate to 3 percent and have introduced in the Senate a bill providing the lower rate. However, if it is impossible to get the 3-percent rate for a 3-year period, I certainly shall support the extension for 3 years of the 3½-percent rate.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, the stockholders of the Marshall County National Farm Loan Association of Marysville, Kans., deeply appreciate the action of Congress in reducing the interest rates on Federal land-bank and Commissioner loans to 3½ percent until July 1, 1942; and

Whereas the act authorizing such reduction has been of great assistance to us in making our thereby reduced payments and aided many in saving their farms; and

Whereas for the most part our county produced a half crop of corn last year, but this was the only sizable crop of corn since 1932; and

Whereas the Marshall County wheat average for 1942 was but 7 bushels per acre; and

Whereas the delinquent installment payments as shown by the annual report were a little over \$100,000, and because we feel a further extension of the present 3½-percent rate is necessary for us and of great benefit to the Federal land bank and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; Therefore

We, the stockholders of the Marshall County National Farm Loan Association, assembled at our annual stockholders' meeting held at Marysville on the 5th of February 1942, at Marysville, Kans., do hereby earnestly request our United States Senators and our Representatives in Congress to extend their aid to the proposed reduction of interest rates originally written in their mortgages from July 1, 1942, for a period of at least 3 years more at the 3½-percent rate which is now in effect.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate disposition a petition signed by sundry citizens of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860. I ask that the petition may be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

PORTSMOUTH, N. H.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned petition for a speedy consideration of the Sheppard bill, S. 860, by the Senate.

In Portsmouth we see an increasing need of such protection as the Navy has now for the Army and for places adjoining the camps.

Laws with regard to vice cannot be enforced until there is a change in the laws concerning alcoholic beverages. A democracy cannot long survive on the weakness of its citizens.

Our enemies within are greater than those without.

If we can better support you in your efforts for this bill, please let us know.

We ask this petition be mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GERTRUDE RAND,
CATHERINE GROSS,
ANNA M. PICKLES,

(and other citizens of Portsmouth, N. H.).

TAXATION OF INCOME FROM STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS—PROTEST OF HON. JULIAN W. BARNARD

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the burden resting on the small-home owner is rapidly increasing. Forms of taxation which discourage home ownership should be used as infrequently as possible. This should be considered in relation to the proposal now made by the United States Treasury to tax income derived from State and municipal bonds. Such bonds place their burden directly on realty holdings and exercise a restrictive influence on individual building of homes.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter I have received from Hon. Julian W. Barnard, solicitor of the borough of Norristown, Pa.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOROUGH OF NORRISTOWN,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Norristown, Pa., February 16, 1942.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senator from Pennsylvania,
the Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

In re Treasury proposal to tax income derived from State and municipal bonds.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I address you on behalf of the boroughs of Pennsylvania. There are approximately 940 boroughs in the State of Pennsylvania within whose confines reside approximately 3,000,000 people, or, roughly, one-third of the population of the State.

Early in the year 1939 I was designated by the Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs to appear before the special Brown committee of the Senate and to there voice the protest of the small towns of Pennsylvania against this form of direct interference with their governmental functioning by the Federal Government.

Again in June of 1939 I was especially designated by the Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs to appear before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress and again urge this protest.

I am a member of the executive committee of the State Association of Boroughs of Pennsylvania and am the chairman of the legislative committee of the Montgomery County (Pa.) Association of Boroughs, a subdivision of the State association.

The Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs in each of its last four annual conventions has unanimously adopted a resolution protesting this proposal.

The Montgomery County Association of Boroughs has likewise adopted such resolutions.

The Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania in May 1939 adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved (if the senate concur) by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, That Federal taxation of State and municipal bonds is inimical to the best interest of this State and its municipalities, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the State's representatives on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives at Washington, the Honorable PATRICK J. BOLAND and the Honorable BENJAMIN JARRETT."

This resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives at Harrisburg May 27, 1939, and agreed to by the Senate of Pennsylvania on May 29, 1939, and transmitted by the chief clerk June 1, 1939.

May I point out to you, sir, that municipalities necessarily, in order to carry on their functions, from time to time with periodic regularity must negotiate long-term bonded loans. Therefore, anything which tends to hamper the freedom or ability with which the municipalities can accomplish such long-term financing, works to the detriment of the municipalities, either in preventing absolutely the realization of some necessary public improvement, or the modernization and rebuilding and improvement of an existing public improvement, or, in the alternative, of increasing the cost to the municipality of such financing; if the cost thereof is sufficiently increased, the improvement may be prevented.

It is generally known that for the past several years municipal financing has been very easy and cheap, which has resulted very beneficially to the municipalities and, hence, to the home owners within the municipalities who must pay the tax. Otherwise, much of the public improvement and public building and public construction that has gone so far toward relieving the depression years would not have been possible.

It has been so clearly demonstrated as I feel to be no longer open to question that any taxation of the municipally issued security, or the income derived therefrom results in the municipality issuing the security paying the tax. This is because it is cheaper for the municipality to assume and pay the tax directly, than it is to compel the purchaser or owner of the bond to anticipate the tax and discount it in his purchase price and income yield demanded.

This, as you know, has been clearly demonstrated in the case of the municipalities in Pennsylvania who have in the past been subjected to a 4 mills State tax (the personal-property tax). Because it has been clearly demonstrated to the municipalities of this Commonwealth that it is actually much cheaper to the municipalities to, as a debtor, assume and pay this tax, the municipalities in Pennsylvania today do so on their outstanding bonds, and the bonds are issued covenanted free from tax, the municipality

itself, as the debtor, assuming and paying the tax. This has been a burden, placed upon the municipalities of the State by the Commonwealth itself; placed upon them indirectly it is true but direct nevertheless insofar as the ultimate result is concerned. There is no possibility of doubt but that any tax placed upon the income derived from municipal bonds by the Federal Government would, in the same manner, become an indirectly applied, but, nonetheless, direct tax by the Federal Government upon the municipalities.

It seems to me it is important for us to bear in mind that at least insofar as boroughs in Pennsylvania are concerned, their source of revenue is restricted to direct taxation upon real estate. Therefore, it follows that anything which to any extent increases the cost of municipal government in Pennsylvania, to that extent increases direct taxation upon real estate.

You might well say the State of Pennsylvania has done this to its own municipalities, why should not the Federal Government do the same thing?

The State of Pennsylvania has done this to its municipalities it is true. The State of Pennsylvania has the power and right to do so if it sees fit. In Pennsylvania the municipalities are the creature of the State. It does not follow that the Federal Government has either the right or the power to do the same thing. Neither the States nor the municipalities are the creature of the Federal Government. On the other hand, the Federal Government is, in fact, the creature of the State.

I know that you are in thorough agreement with me when I say that anything calculated to increase the tax burden on the small home owner should be avoided. On the other hand, anything which tends to lighten this direct tax burden upon the small home owner should be encouraged.

Take the situation in Norristown. This is an industrial town of almost 40,000 population. There are over 9,000 homes in the town. Of these 9,000 homes, I feel it is perfectly safe to say that at least 8,000 are small, modest workingmen's homes.

Another thing, in Pennsylvania boroughs are limited by law in the amount of taxation they may raise in each and every year. The law limits the tax to 15 mills per annum. Many of the towns are now annually levying the maximum millage. They, therefore, do not have the means of increasing their tax revenues, and as the cost of Government goes up they have no alternative but to restrict and diminish their necessary local services.

For instance, permit me to illustrate. Let us assume that Norristown employs 40 policemen upon its police force, and that the cost of government goes up (as it is going up), and that Norristown does not have the means of raising additional tax revenues. The only alternative would seem to be to discharge a few policemen, but the desperate need of Norristown and every other small town is more and better policemen, not less.

The municipalities furnish the public within their confines public safety, police protection, fire protection, streets and highways, lighting, and illumination of the streets and highways, sanitation and health, including garbage collection and disposal, sewage collection and disposal, and all of the other essential daily needs of the citizens in a compact community. It is obvious that a town like this could not exist 48 hours without adequate fire, police, and sanitary protection.

I know that you are sincere in your desire, not only to protect and preserve democracy but to enlarge, improve, and extend it. Therefore, it is apparent to any student of democracy such as yourself that the real secret of the success of any democracy is the small-

town government, or local home rule. That those things which touch most closely the lives and welfare of the people should be kept, in their control, close to the people; where the people can get at the responsible head promptly. That is why you find municipal government best and most efficient in the smaller towns, where every member of council is personally acquainted with the vast majority of the constituents in his particular ward; where, when a public improvement is a building, every member of council sees it from time to time during its progress, and a vast majority of the citizens of the town see it as it progresses; where it is an easy and simple matter for the rate elector and taxpayer to locate his councilman and voice his protest if the occasion arises. It is obvious, therefore, that only in the comparatively small town, where such conditions can and do exist, can the people have and enjoy pure democracy.

Therefore, I cannot but assume that you will join with me in agreeing that anything, no matter what, which has a definite tendency to hamper, interfere with, restrict, or increase the cost of the operation of local home rule, or local municipal government in the small towns and townships of Pennsylvania, is to be slapped down by all loyal Americans who entertain a real desire to preserve and perpetuate democracy as we have known it.

Let me say to you, Senator, that those of us who in Pennsylvania are responsible for the continued welfare of our towns are truly very much alarmed and frightened at this proposal. We cannot help but feel that the Federal Government ought to have no desire to interfere, hamper, or burden us in the running of our towns; surely we have no desire to hamper or interfere with the Federal Government in the performance of its many essential duties. It is only when the Federal Government proposes something which definitely interferes with us that you gentlemen in Washington hear anything in the nature of a protest from the governments of the small towns in Pennsylvania.

Nor does the anticipated benefit to the Federal Government justify the means. The Treasury has stated that it anticipates that such a proposal would increase the Federal revenues by \$200,000,000 a year. I say to you that by no known and recognized mathematical processes can such an anticipation be justified, but even if it did, would \$200,000,000 a year be so important, in a Federal Budget of perhaps thirty, forty, fifty, sixty billion dollars a year as to justify the flaunting of the democratic American principle that each separate unit of the Government shall be free and untrammelled within its own sphere, and shall not encroach upon the sphere of another? Senator, I urge you to pause and consider whether, if you once break down that principle in operation, there shall remain any real assurance that local home rule is not on the way out.

On behalf of the people of Norristown, as well as on behalf of all of the people of all of the small towns in Pennsylvania, I urge you to firmly and unalterably oppose this proposal.

Very truly yours,

JULIAN W. BARNARD,
Borough Solicitor.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

Mr. BYRD, during the recess of the Senate, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 2284) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making elective officers

and heads of executive departments ineligible to receive annuity benefits under such act, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1100) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5458. A bill to amend the organic act of Alaska; with amendments (Rept. No. 1101).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1842. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2980. A bill for the relief of National Heating Co., Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1103); and

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of Estella King; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1104).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3200. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105).

By Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1776. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes S. Hathaway; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1106);

H. R. 4557. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1107);

H. R. 4626. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Jane Hawk, a minor, and J. L. Hawk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108); and

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of the Louis Puccinelli Bail Bond Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1647. A bill for the relief of William H. Dugdale and wife; without amendment (Rept. No. 1110).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 5545. A bill for the relief of H. Earle Russell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1111).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 18, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1133. An act to authorize the transfer of lands from the United States to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission under certain conditions, and to accept title to another tract to be transferred to the United States;

S. 1368. An act relating to lands of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians;

S. 1521. An act to provide that the Navy ration may include canned or powdered or concentrated fruit or vegetable juices;

S. 1630. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps; and

S. 2192. An act to extend the time for examination of quarterly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Navy.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2286. A bill to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes;

S. 2287. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937;

S. 2288. A bill to amend subsection 11 (b) of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

S. 2289. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment, administration, and maintenance of a Coast Guard Auxiliary and a Coast Guard Reserve," approved February 19, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2290. A bill to further reduce for 2 additional years the interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, and on Land Bank Commissioner's loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 2291. A bill to extend the time within which the amount of any national marketing quota for tobacco, proclaimed under section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, may be increased; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2292. A bill for the relief of Vernon E. Deus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2293. A bill to provide for taking into custody certain persons who are citizens or subjects of, or owe allegiance to, any nation or country with which the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF ALASKA—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5458) to amend the Organic Act of Alaska, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO CANADA

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix an address by the President broadcast in Canada on February 15, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR REFORM—ARTICLE BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, published in the New York Times of today, entitled "The Need for Reform," which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6446) to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances

of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof, and civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments, during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gillette	Nye
Bailey	Glass	O'Daniel
Ball	Green	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Gurney	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Nerring	Radcliffe
Bone	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Holman	Rosier
Brooks	Hughes	Schwartz
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Tobey
Chavez	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Norris	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has been called to the State of Pennsylvania on official business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent in a hospital because of a hip injury.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am ready now to proceed with the consideration of the pending measure. I believe there are one or two amendments to be proposed, and I suggest that they be proposed now.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. With the permission of the Senator from Massachusetts, as one of the sponsors of the legislation to repeal the retirement or pension provision for Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the President, Vice President, and officers of the Cabinet, on behalf of the Senate Civil Service Com-

mittee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and I desire to report, with the approval of the Civil Service Committee, legislation for the repeal of such pensions.

It was preferable, I think, Mr. President, notwithstanding the public demand for quick action for such repeal, that the Senate proceed in the normal way, permitting the proper committee to have such hearings as may be advisable and to give due consideration to the repealer resolution introduced on February 3 by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the junior Senator from Virginia.

This was done. Full and adequate hearings were held, and the committee reports favorably the repeal, designating the junior Senator from Virginia to present it to the Senate.

I shall consume only a very short time, Mr. President, in presenting this measure for immediate consideration. I feel that every Member of the Senate has determined his position regarding it. I want to say, however, that in the next few days the junior Senator from Virginia will offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD testimony given yesterday before the Civil Service Committee by Mr. Harry B. Mitchell, the president of the Civil Service Commission, which corroborates all the statements heretofore made by the junior Senator from Virginia with respect to the details of the congressional pension plan. I shall do so, Mr. President, because some of these statements have been challenged on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere. As the meeting of the Civil Service Committee did not adjourn until nearly midnight last night, the transcript of such testimony is not available at this time.

I can now say, however, that Mr. Mitchell confirmed the statement made by me that a Member of Congress with a minimum service of 5 years who may be eligible to retire in the coming January can, upon the payment of less than \$5, receive a life pension varying in accordance with the length of service from approximately \$50 per month to approximately \$350 per month. That is to say, Mr. Mitchell confirmed information that previously had been given the junior Senator from Virginia that such pensions could be received for life merely by the payment of several dollars.

Mr. Mitchell further confirmed the fact that if a Member of Congress becomes disabled and cannot perform his accustomed work, within the opinion of the Civil Service Commission, he at once becomes eligible for a pension, regardless of his age, provided he has served as long as 5 years and has qualified under the act.

Mr. Mitchell further confirmed the fact that pensions in lesser amounts could be received beginning at the age of 55 instead of the age of 62, as has been commonly understood.

Mr. Mitchell further confirmed the fact that a Member of Congress defeated in the fall elections and who is eligible to receive a pension need not apply until after the election.

I make this statement merely because statements to the contrary have been made with respect to these specific items.

The detailed testimony of Mr. Mitchell to be inserted later in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will answer conclusively these and other questions, and will show, also, that under the optional features of this pension legislation as it now stands, a Member of Congress has the choice, under certain conditions, of quite a number of different classes of pensions. By this I mean pensions at different rates.

These questions, however, I shall not attempt to discuss further now, as I think the Senate is anxious to take prompt action on this repeal legislation.

As the record of votes and the amendments offered in committees are not a part of the records of the Senate, I want to state that the junior Senator from Virginia, in the Senate Civil Service Committee, offered an amendment to the House bill to strike out all reference to elective officials. This amendment failed of adoption, because of a tie vote, 5 in favor and 5 against. The junior Senator from Virginia then voted against the retirement legislation on its final passage.

Today, we are repealing this legislation in response to a nearly universal demand on the part of the American people. It is an example of democracy at work.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD. I have not yet offered my amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia that I consent that the amendment may be offered at this time, because after conferring with the leader on this side we think the amendment might just as well be disposed of now, and the other amendment taken up after this amendment shall have been disposed of. I did not wish to mislead the Senator, who is free to offer his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer for immediate consideration an amendment to House bill 6446, which embodies the bill reported by the Committee on Civil Service. I may say that the amendment is offered on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I wish merely to make a very brief explanation of the amendment. It excludes from the retirement plan all elective officials—Members of Congress, Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the President, and the Vice President. It likewise excludes Cabinet members.

One section provides that any payments which have been made up to this time under the legislation passed by the Senate on January 19 shall be refunded by those in charge of the retirement fund to Representatives and Senators who are excluded by the amendment, to others who hold elective offices, and any others so excluded.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as one of the members of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, which met last night, I should like to follow the remarks of the Senator from Virginia with a brief statement on four points which have become

clear to me during the consideration of the bill in the committee and on the floor of the Senate.

On December 18 I joined with four other members of the Committee on Civil Service—the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]—in supporting a motion made in the committee to strike from the retirement bill the provisions relating to elective officers. I then supported the Byrd amendment on the floor of the Senate, and when that was not adopted I voted against the bill, although I favored all provisions of the bill except those as to elective officers. Last night, following the same reasoning, I joined in a recommendation for the repeal of the provisions of the new law approved January 24 relating to elective officers.

The first point I wish to emphasize is that it seems to me that in passing this measure we are to an extent setting a precedent as to what we regard as an essential or a nonessential expenditure. If we were to allow this provision to remain in the law as it now is, it would mean that in these days, when we should expend funds only for essential matters, that we were recognizing this provision for retirement benefits for elective officers as an essential expenditure. I believe that in these critical days, when we are endeavoring to define what is and what is not an essential expenditure, it is in the interest of the country and of the Congress that we do not include retirement payments to elective officials as essential expenditures. Considering the fact that the provision has not been in effect for many years past, it seems obvious that we can get along without it for a time longer.

Secondly, I wish to make the point that the law itself is not as revolutionary as it has been represented. I think it is important that the Senate recognize, in this regard, a fact which was new to me, that under the law as it now stands, and as it will be in the event the repealer shall be adopted, service in Congress can be counted in making up the credit upon which retirement benefits are computed by one who is entitled to retirement benefits as a member of the appointive service of the Government. For example, if a Member of Congress now serving were to be defeated, and were later appointed to a Federal office, and should, under that appointment, become entitled to retirement benefits, he could include in the computation of his retirement benefits his previous service in the Congress. That is the law as it now stands, and as it has been interpreted by the Civil Service Commission.

Furthermore, it was stated by a representative of the Civil Service Commission at the hearing last night that if a man were in the appointive service at the present time, and went immediately from the appointive service to service in Congress, he would be permitted, under the present practice, to receive retirement benefits for his whole service, including that in Congress. He could take into

consideration both periods of continuous service, where he already was a member of the retirement system before entering Congress.

The third point I wish to emphasize is that the bill, as it was passed on January 24, did not emphasize the contributory feature of the retirement benefit system as applied to prior service. It has been stated that pensions were voted to Members of Congress. As I understand a pension, it is a payment that is made without a contributory payment by the beneficiary. But a distinction is made where the beneficiary does pay at least a portion of the premium necessary to purchase, on annuity basis, the amount he receives.

Under the law as it was passed on January 24, the required payment in some instances is so small that it becomes a negligible factor in the transaction. Therefore the Byrd amendment was presented, which insisted upon the contributory feature. I supported that measure on the floor of the Senate, because I believe that if we are to distinguish between pensions and contributory benefits we in Congress should cling closely to the contributory benefit retirement theory and should insist on that system, at least, in our own cases.

I may say that until 1938 it was the practice under the Federal system to require individuals who came into the system to make back payments as a condition of taking advantage of prior service under the system. That has been liberalized since. I might point out, however, that it is the practice in some of the States of the Union, and therefore a practice close to the people, that when persons do come under the retirement system at a later date they should make back payments if they are to take credit for their corresponding prior service.

In support of that statement I might refer to the situation under the Ohio retirement law, which went into effect in 1935, and in 1938 was amended to include municipal employees. The condition was made that if municipal employees wish to have credit for prior service as far back as 1935 or earlier they must pay their back retirement premiums to 1935, the date of the enactment of the law.

In 1941 the law of Ohio was amended, apparently, so as to include elective officers under the Ohio retirement system. There was at the same time included in the law the following provision, in section 486-48 of the General Code:

Credit for service between January 1, 1935, and June 30, 1941, may be secured by such elective official provided he shall pay into the employees' savings fund an amount equal to the accumulated contributions of such member had he been a member during such period.

I believe, therefore, that if a retirement measure for elective officers shall come before the Congress at a later date there will be an important element of fairness in requiring elective officers who become members of the retirement system to pay back premiums corresponding to their prior service if the system is to be regarded as a contributory system.

Finally, this fourth point: The bill as passed on January 24 applied to the

sitting Members of Congress. I think it is the impression throughout the country that there is a policy against members of any legislative body voting increases of compensation to themselves to take effect during their current term of office. That is frequently expressed in the constitutions of different States and is frequently expressed in the charters of different cities. That being a feeling which is close to the practice of the people in the States and cities, they naturally have, I believe, felt some surprise that any action could be taken under our Federal Constitution which would permit the Congress to vote any kind of emolument that might attach in any way to the Members of Congress during the very term in which they were serving when voting it.

It is true that under the Constitution of the United States the provision as to Congress, in article I, section 6, clause 1, does not place a limitation upon the action of Congress. It expressly there states that—

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law—

without a limitation in the Constitution.

As to judges there is a provision in article III, section 1, of the Constitution, but that relates to the diminution of their pay. It says that—

The judges . . . shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

But as to the President of the United States there is an express declaration of policy and of law, and I believe it is appropriate that it should be read into the RECORD at this time, because it seems to me that the law as passed on January 24, in offering to the present President in his present term of office an annuity under this law, is violative of the spirit, if not actually of the language, of this provision. The Constitution states, in article II, section 1, clause 6:

The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services a compensation which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

I mention that as indicating the thing to which I have referred—a feeling that increases should not be permitted to take effect during the term of office of those who pass upon them.

As further indicative of that, I call attention to the fact that in the constitutions of many States there are similar provisions, especially as to changes in the salaries of members of their legislatures. I have not had an opportunity to examine them all, but I know that such prohibitions appear in the Constitutions of the States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Kentucky. Many States do not need to prohibit such legislative action, because they fix in their constitutions the exact pay which a member of the legislature shall receive. It would in those cases require an amendment to the constitution to increase such salaries.

Such changes also are prohibited by the charters of some cities, as they are prohibited by the charter of the city of Cleveland, Ohio.

What has been the practice of Congress in fixing salaries of Members of Congress? This raises the issue in a concrete manner. In the early days Congress raised the pay of its Members whenever Congress felt like it and applied it to Members in their current term of office. That is of interest especially because there was an amendment submitted to the Constitution of the United States along with the original 10 amendments which would have prohibited that practice, but the amendment did not receive the support of a sufficient number of States to stop the practice. But in 1873 there occurred an action of historical interest to the Congress. In 1873, when Congress sought, I believe, to raise the pay of Members of Congress from \$5,000 to \$7,500 a year, the increase was made applicable to the beginning of that term of Congress. It became known as the "salary grab of 1873." There was such an immediate reaction against it throughout the country that in January 1874 it was repealed; and when action finally was taken, I believe, in 1907, to make that increase, it was made applicable by one Congress to the next Congress. So also when the increase from \$7,500 to \$10,000 was made in 1925, it was made applicable to the next Congress.

Therefore, if this question should again come before Congress for consideration, it seems important that Congress should properly consider carefully insisting upon the contributive feature of it, and also consider limiting its benefits to those who shall be Members of a subsequent Congress, and perhaps, in the case of the Senate, to those Members of the Senate who will have begun new terms since action was had conferring the new benefits.

Finally, I think the answer, under present conditions, turns upon what today should be regarded as an essential expenditure and what should not. I believe we should not include this item of retirement benefits to Members of Congress, to the President, and to the Cabinet, within our definition of essential expenditures in these days.

For that reason I support the repeal amendment as submitted by the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to have the amendment read from the desk at this time, or simply printed in the RECORD?

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. Amendment offered by MESSRS. BYRD, BURTON, BAILEY, and JOHNSON of Colorado:

On page 12, line 1, after "department", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "except when used in section 15."

On page 20, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "section 12" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 12 and 15."

At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

Sec. 15. (a) The last sentence of subsection (c) of the first section of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "any elective officer."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 2 of such act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "Provided, however, That no provision of this or any other act relating to automatic separation from the service shall have any application whatever to any elective officer."

(c) Subsection (a) of section 3 of such act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) This act shall apply to all officers and employees in or under the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the United States Government, and to all officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, except elective officers and heads of executive departments: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to any such officer or employee of the United States or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia subject to another retirement system for such officers and employees of such governments: *Provided further*, That this act shall not apply to any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers and employees which were made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, until he gives notice in writing to the disbursing officer by whom his salary is paid of his desire to come within the purview of this act; and any officer or employee within such classes may, within 60 days after January 24, 1942, withdraw from the purview of this act by giving similar notice of such desire. In the case of any officer or employee in the service of the legislative branch of the Government on January 24, 1942, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within the calendar year 1942. In the case of any officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government who enters the service after January 24, 1942, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of entrance to the service."

(d) The amounts deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of any officer made ineligible for the benefits of such act of May 29, 1930, as amended, by the amendments made by this section to such act of May 29, 1930, and deposited to the credit of the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and any additional amounts paid into such fund by such officer, shall be returned to such officer within 30 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that neither the Senator from Massachusetts nor any other Senator can retain the floor indefinitely and farm it out. It is becoming the practice, because a Senator is in charge of a bill, to assume that he has the floor. The next thing we know he will have the floor when he is in his committee room.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, at this time I offer an amendment to the pending bill, in the nature of a substitute, which I have prepared and sent to the desk, and ask to have read. It is very brief. It deals with perhaps the most important domestic matter before the United States today, and I hope it may be clearly understood.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], it is proposed to insert the following:

That clause (1) of section 2 (b) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "65" and inserting in lieu thereof "60."

Sec. 2. Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1942, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who at the time of such expenditure is 60 years of age or older and is not an inmate of a public institution, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$30 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month, and (2) 5 percent of such amount, which shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose."

Sec. 3. Paragraph (1) of section 3 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "and if such amount is less than one-half of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on July 1, 1942.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator's proposal a substitute or an amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. It is a substitute for the Byrd amendment. I am informed by one of my friendly colleagues that I originally described it as a proposed substitute for the pending bill. I did not mean that. I meant it as a substitute for the Byrd amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Is not the pending Byrd amendment a bill in itself?

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand that it is offered as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand; but the Senator from Virginia has offered no amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; he has.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's proposal is an amendment to an existing law.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall not discuss parliamentary procedure with the distinguished Senator, because I cannot do it. However, I am told by

the Parliamentarian of the Senate and by other distinguished counselors that what I am doing is in proper order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator to clarify the situation. If the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute should be agreed to, would it do away with the repealer of the so-called congressional pensions?

Mr. DOWNEY. It would do away with the Byrd amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Leaving the congressional pensions intact?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then the sawdust trail would have to be opened up again.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me state my position to the distinguished Senator. Many Senators now in the Chamber have told me within the past day or so that they desire to vote for the pension proposal which I am offering. Some of them desire to vote for it as a substitute for the Byrd amendment. Some of them desire to have the Byrd amendment become effective and have my proposal presented as an amendment, in addition to the Byrd amendment. I intend to give Senators the opportunity to vote upon my proposal in both forms. That is, if it is defeated as a substitute, I shall then offer it later as an amendment to the bill, so that all of us may have the opportunity to express to the American people how we feel upon the subject of pensions for our unfortunate elderly people.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Probably the able Senator has already answered the inquiry I am about to propound. As I understand, his proposal operates as a double-barreled shotgun. It would not repeal annuities to Members of Congress, as would the Byrd amendment. If the Senator's proposal should be agreed to, would the original measure which passed the Senate stand so far as it affects Members of Congress?

Mr. DOWNEY. It would.

Mr. McNARY. If the Senator's proposal should be defeated, does he intend then to offer it as an amendment to the bill now sponsored by the able Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I have before me a copy of the Senator's amendment. As I understand, it is offered as an amendment to House bill 6446.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator has my second "barrel." That is not the first "barrel." The first "barrel" is at the desk. It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Senator has the second "barrel," which I hope I shall not have to use.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand—I may be in error—that the Senator intends to incorporate the Byrd amendment in his substitute, and offer it as a substitute for the Byrd amendment. That would carry with it the repeal of annuities to Members to Congress and at the same time would carry with it old-age assistance.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me state to the distinguished Senator that if the Senate does not desire to accept the pension proposal in the form of a substitute, I intend, in effect, to do the very thing which the distinguished Senator has now pointed out.

Mr. O'DANIEL rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like to be able to proceed with my statement; but I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If the substitute measure now offered by the Senator from California should be agreed to, would it then be in order to have the Byrd amendment reoffered as an amendment to the pending bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that it would be in order to offer it again.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I wish the Senator from California would not offer his so-called first-barrel amendment. It would compel those of us who believe that the repeal of congressional pensions is necessary to vote against another proposal to which we are committed and in which we believe.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if Senators will permit me to make a very brief statement of my own position, I think the situation of my proposal will be entirely clarified.

First, let me state to the Senate the ultimate effect of the amendment which was just read from the desk. The present pension age in the United States is 65 years. If this proposal were passed it would be reduced to 60. The present Federal payment for pensions is \$20 a month as a maximum, subject to matching in whole or in part by the State.

My proposal provides that the Federal Government shall lift that \$20 a month to \$30 a month, and that it shall be paid to every State without the necessity of matching by the State. However, the bill in one respect does not conform to my own ideas. I have molded my own bill to suit what I know is the desire of a majority of Senators. The \$30 a month would be paid only on the basis of need and not as a social dividend or a social right.

Mr. President, in order to make the facts as clear and intelligible as possible, let me state that in the next fiscal year it is anticipated that payments by the Federal Government in matching the old-age assistance program will amount to about \$329,000,000. In addition to

that, W. P. A. expenditures for persons above 60 years of age and under 65 are expected to run over \$100,000,000—perhaps \$150,000,000. We now spend for general relief for persons between 60 and 65 years of age in a very unhappy, chaotic way another \$100,000,000 or \$200,000,000.

Consequently, if the bill were to become law, out of expenditures presently being made we should save as a credit against what the bill would cost us perhaps some \$500,000,000, \$600,000,000, or \$700,000,000. From data which I have secured from the Social Security Board it would appear that the cost of the measure, if the amendment were to become law, would be somewhere around the gross sum of about \$1,000,000,000, \$1,100,000,000, or \$1,250,000,000. If we deduct from the gross cost the present cost of caring for our elderly people—a cost which would be saved by the bill—the net cost or the net increment by reason of the bill would be somewhere around \$500,000,000, \$600,000,000, or \$700,000,000. The figures cannot be definite, because they are largely matters of estimate.

Mr. President, let me point out to the Senate that while \$500,000,000, \$600,000,000, or \$700,000,000 still sounds like a very great sum, yet it is estimated that in the next fiscal year the Nation's pay rolls that are covered under old-age insurance will run to about \$55,000,000,000; so a 1-percent tax upon those pay rolls—which, incidentally, already is being levied for social-security purposes—would raise about \$550,000,000, or sufficient to pay all the expenses of this proposal.

We should not forget, Mr. President, that we are now a nation of tremendous wealth and power. If we look merely upon the debit side, we may be shocked; but if we look also upon the credit side, we will see that our resources are almost unlimited.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the Senator's estimate of the number of persons in the United States above the age of 60?

Mr. DOWNEY. There are about 14,000,000 above 60, of which about 6,000,000 are between 60 and 65, and 8,000,000 over 65.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Senator any estimate or any information as to what percentage of the fourteen or fifteen million persons above the age of 60 would be eligible for the \$30 a month payment provided in his amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I will say to the distinguished Senator that I have not come before the Senate without data of that kind. Of course, I am prepared to give it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In asking the question, of course, I did not assume that the Senator did not have such data.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should not have asked the Senator the question if I had not thought he could answer it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very happy to have so good a friend. Of course, generally a question is asked in the hope that it cannot be answered. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I asked the question because I thought the Senator could answer it.

Mr. DOWNEY. As the Senator knows, at the present time we are providing relief for needy persons above 65 years of age. Their number is about 2,000,000 at the present time. It is anticipated that if we should bring in that tragic group of persons who are between 60 and 65 years of age, another 1,000,000 persons, approximately, would be added to the pension rolls. So if this measure should pass, about 3,000,000 persons, plus another 100,000 or 200,000 persons, perhaps, would be eligible for pensions on the basis of a means test.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator this question: His amendment directs the Secretary of the Treasury to turn over to the States the amount involved in his calculation, which would have to be paid under his amendment, to be administered by the States. It is a contribution unmatched, as I understand, by the States—a contribution to the States, to be administered and expended by the States through their own State officers. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; that is not correct. The amendment would not amend the present Social Security Act in that way. The money would be paid over under this proposal just as it is now paid, except that it would be paid over to the States, even though they might not be able to match it.

I may say that the Senator's own State of Kentucky, where \$8 is paid today, and the State of Virginia, where \$10 is paid, need pay nothing, if they so desired, or could continue their present payments, and yet would receive for their unfortunate elderly citizens the sum of \$30 a month; but let me say to the Senator—I am trying to get to his point—that the money would still be expended by the State, subject to exactly the same kind of Federal regulations and safeguards as are contained in the present law, which I have not proposed to change at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator tell me whether the effect of his amendment would be to place the \$30 payments squarely on the shoulders of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would that be in addition to whatever is now paid under the matching system, or would it be a substitute for it?

Mr. DOWNEY. It would be a substitute. I tried to make it clear that what the Federal Government now is paying for old-age assistance and in W. P. A. assistance, to persons past 60, would not continue to be paid; money now expended for general relief would not be paid. This would stand in lieu of all of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. So what is now being paid could be withdrawn; the States could withdraw their contributions, and yet the \$30 a month would still be paid to those entitled to it? Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has referred to my State and to the State of Virginia. I have publicly deplored the fact that the legislature of my State provided a maximum of only \$7.50 as a con-

tribution, which made it impossible for anyone to draw more than \$15 as a maximum, because the Federal Government puts up only what the State matches. I have frequently discussed with the Senator and with others the possibility of providing what might be regarded as a fair national standard for the payment of old-age subsistence, so that it would not depend upon the whim or the ability of a State to match the payments made by the Federal Government. I should like to get a little more information, if the Senator can give it to me, as to whether, if a State should withdraw its contribution, \$30 a month would still be paid, on the assumption that it was, after all, a Federal obligation; and if the States should withdraw from matching participation, some 2,000,000 persons who now are drawing benefits throughout the country, as I understand, would cease to receive the benefits of State participation. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. Any State that did not desire to contribute to the fund would not have to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; they do not have to do so now. They have to contribute if they get anything out of the Treasury; but they are not required to contribute. They can ignore the subject entirely, but in that event they get nothing from the Treasury in the way of old-age assistance.

I am wondering upon what the Senator bases the estimate that there would be, at the worst, only about 3,000,000 persons who would be eligible and who would participate in the program of \$30-per-month payments provided for in his amendment, unless he assumes that all the States would either continue to put up whatever their legislatures have authorized in addition to this or would increase it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think we misunderstand each other.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my fault, I will say.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I do not think it is.

Let me make it plain to the Senator in this way: I called upon the Social Security Board for an estimate of the number of persons between 60 and 65 who are destitute, the number of persons who have no children to support them, the number of persons who have no savings and no jobs, the number of persons who are living lives so miserable and despairing that we, sitting here warm and well fed, cannot even imagine it. The Social Security Board, I may say to the distinguished Senator, reported to me that there are approximately 1,000,000 persons in the United States between 60 and 65 who today are destitute, suffering, and miserable, and without children to support them. We already have upon the relief rolls 2,000,000 persons, those in Kentucky getting \$8 a month, and those in Virginia \$10 a month, and those in California \$40 a month. Under this proposal, if Kentucky wanted to continue its \$8 it could do so, and the pensioners of Kentucky would get \$38. In California I would hope and expect that we would add \$30 a month to the Federal

contribution, giving \$60 to an unmarried person and \$100 to a married couple.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator another question there.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky about the parliamentary situation? It will not interfere with the colloquy which is proceeding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. BONE. I want to get the parliamentary situation straight in my mind in case a vote comes. I understand the Senator from California has offered his amendment as a double-barreled affair, first as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and then he indicates he is going to tender it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Only if, when offered as a substitute, the amendment is defeated.

Mr. BONE. I presume Senators all want to vote on the Byrd amendment. I desire to ask the Senator from Kentucky if, for instance, those who favor the amendment tendered by the Senator from California should vote for it and there were sufficient votes in the affirmative, which, presumptively, would eliminate the Byrd amendment, could the Senator from Virginia then offer his amendment later on?

Mr. BARKLEY. The situation now is that the Senator from California has offered his amendment as a substitute for the Byrd amendment, so that if the substitute should be adopted we would retain the congressional-pension provision and provide pensions for those who would come under the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. BONE. My reason for asking the question is that the Senator from California is assured, I assume, of a vote on his amendment if he tenders it merely as a separate amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly; there undoubtedly will be a vote on it whether it is offered as a separate amendment to the bill now pending or to the Byrd amendment, and it would be in order as an amendment to the Byrd amendment, because, under the practice of the Senate, the committee amendment, being a substitute for the entire bill, is regarded as the original text, and a second amendment is in order.

Mr. BONE. I was only curious as to why the Senator should offer it in both forms, if he could offer it as a separate amendment to the pending bill and not complicate his amendment with the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to pursue my inquiry.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will be happy to answer the Senator, if I can.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's view is that the \$30 a month provided in his amendment would, in the first place, apply to a million persons who are not now on the rolls and who are between the ages of 60 and 65?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would also apply to 2,000,000 persons who are on the rolls and who are drawing \$8 or \$10 a month

from the combined contributions of the States and the Federal Government?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that if there are 3,000,000 in the class who would all be entitled to the \$30 a month, which is \$360 a year, to arrive at the probable cost, all it is necessary to do is to multiply \$360 by the number of persons who would be eligible for the benefit, and the result would be an actual cost to the Treasury—

Mr. DOWNEY. The cost would be something over a billion dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be something over a billion dollars?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Is the \$30 contemplated to be paid out of the Federal Treasury to be paid to everyone, regardless of financial condition?

Mr. DOWNEY. Only on the basis of need; that is, there has to be a showing by the applicant that he has no children who can support him, no savings, and no job.

Mr. OVERTON. As I interpret the amendment as read from the desk, the Federal Government is to turn over \$30 a month to the States to be administered according to State laws?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; according to the present Social Security Act, which makes the payment on the basis of need. In other words, I may say to the distinguished Senator—and I hope there will be no confusion on this point—the Social Security Act and the old-age assistance provision in it are not changed in any respect, and this payment will be made on the basis of need under the same rules and regulations now established by the Federal Government.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Except as to the age change from 60 to 65, does not the act remain—

Mr. DOWNEY. And except there would be no longer any necessity for matching by the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I correct in stating that, irrespective of what the States may contribute, the Federal Government would pay up to \$30 a month to each person in need who is 60 years of age or over?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the States desire to match the Federal Government up to \$40, as now provided by law, would not the Federal Government be compelled to put up \$30 plus \$20, or a total of \$50 a month for each needy person, should the Senator's amendment be adopted?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. According to the way the amendment is drawn, the maximum is entirely cut out; there will be a flat contribution of \$30 a month; then the State can do whatever it wants to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the Federal Government would pay up to \$30 per month, irrespective of what the States do, but the States could volun-

tarily add whatever amount they desire to the \$30 Federal contribution.

Mr. DOWNEY. A State could add any amount it wanted to; it could add more than that. I am told by the counsel of the Social Security Board that if a State wanted to add \$40 or \$50 during the coming year that would not in any way prejudice any other State that paid \$30 a month.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is my understanding that the Senator's amendment merely raises the maximum payment by the Federal Government from \$20 to \$30?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That does not mean that \$30 definitely will be paid, but will only be paid as a maximum, and differing amounts up to \$30 will be paid on the basis of need.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator from Texas is correct in his statement. If the authorities should find that a person did not need the whole \$30 because, we will say, he already had an income of \$25 or \$30, it would be up to the State to determine how much was needed to support him; that is correct; but I would say to the distinguished Senator that, in my figures, I have assumed that all the 3,000,000 persons who might be eligible would be entitled to the full \$30 a month. I will state further to the distinguished Senator from Texas, who for a long time has been greatly interested in pensions, that, in my opinion, almost double the number would receive the \$30 a month if it were granted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator a written statement from the Social Security Board as to the cost of the amendment if it were enacted into law?

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia I have several files of material containing all the data I am giving. I have not had an opportunity to secure from the Social Security Board the data upon this exact plan, but I can furnish the data which will verify the figures I am giving to the distinguished Senator, and will be glad to do so during the afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. The reason I ask the question is that the Senator from California has used the word "destitute," and he has said that there are a million persons between 60 and 65 who are destitute. As a matter of fact, the word used in his amendment is "needy." There is quite a distinction between complete destitution and need. Is it not also true that the determination of who is needy is left to the State authorities, and what the Senator proposes to do is that the Federal Government shall furnish the money and let the State authorities decide who is needy? Am I not correct in that?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia a question.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the Senator from California answer my question; then the distinguished Senator

from Washington may ask the question he has in mind.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I stand corrected by the Senator from Virginia in the inaccurate use of the word "destitute" as applying to the characterization of the Social Security Board. They did certify this figure to me as applying to needy persons, I will admit; but I want to say, from my own knowledge and observation, these persons are destitute, and that is something worse than needy, I am sure.

Mr. BYRD. I am not arguing that. What I say is that the estimate of 1,000,000, if the matter is put on a complete destitution basis, is nothing like as large a number as if it is put on a needy basis. Therefore, I think the Senator has very largely underestimated the cost of the proposal.

Mr. DOWNEY. I can immediately clarify the mind of the Senator from Virginia on that subject. The Social Security Board has given me this figure of approximately 1,000,000 persons who, in its opinion, would be entitled to claim benefits under the amendment as it is now drawn.

Mr. BYRD. But a little while ago the Senator stated that there were a million completely destitute persons. It makes quite a difference, in the construction of this law, whether a person is destitute or whether he is needy; and the question is to be determined, not by the authorities in Washington, as I understand, but by the authorities in the different States. They may have varying standards as to who is needy and who is not needy.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I should like, if I may, to ask the Senator from Virginia if he is willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from California and add it to and make it a part of his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Washington make that as a request or an inquiry?

Mr. BONE. I merely want to be helpful to both Senators in the complication that confronts us; and I wondered if the Senator from Virginia might be willing to accept this amendment, so that we could vote on both of them at the same time, since there seems to be an insistence here on coupling them together in a fashion which makes it impossible to vote in a perfectly honest way. With this substitute offered, no man could split his vote. I merely want to be helpful, and to put the matter in a little more understandable way.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. DOXEY. It is possible that the matter about which I wish to inquire has been explained. I was unavoidably called from the Chamber.

Is it possible that the Senator from California could offer his proposition as an amendment instead of as a substitute, in order that those of us who want to vote directly on the Byrd proposal may do so, and then vote on the proposal of

the Senator from California as an independent question?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I will say to the distinguished Senator that that may be done, and it is my intention to do that if the substitute measure is defeated.

Mr. DOXEY. Why does the Senator insist on offering his proposal as a substitute?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in that connection, may I make a suggestion?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest to the Senator from California, in order to meet the suggestions which have already been made by those who want to vote for the Byrd amendment and those who also want to vote for the amendment of the Senator from California, that the Senator modify his own substitute by incorporating in it the Byrd amendment. Then he will have a double-barreled proposition that can be voted on at one time. Then we can vote on the Senator's substitute, which is a repeal of the congressional annuity, and, in addition, vote for the old-age pension. The Senator may modify his own amendment in that regard.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I see the wisdom of what the Senator suggests, and I am almost persuaded by it; but I point out to him that then I might escape from one horn of the dilemma to be impaled upon another, because a very substantial number of Senators do not want to and will not vote for the Byrd amendment, and I should lose their votes. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I had already explained that if the substitute measure is defeated, it is my intention to offer the amendment by itself, in which case Senators may express themselves independently upon my amendment without reference to anything else.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two on the merits of the proposal.

As I understand, the Senator's information and advice is that under his amendment 1,000,000 old people between 60 and 65 would be added to the present list.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. And that some 2,000,000 are now receiving old-age assistance.

Mr. DOWNEY. Two million persons above 65 are now receiving old-age assistance.

Mr. GEORGE. Two million?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator knows, of course, that not all the old people above 65 are on the rolls. In my own State, for instance, only about half of them have been certified. They are there, and they are really in need, but the State has not raised enough money to match the funds that come from the Federal Government; so that about 40,000 or

50,000—I have forgotten the exact number—about half of those who are really entitled to old-age benefits under existing law are not on the list. So more than 3,000,000 persons would be on the list under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Georgia at that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that in the State of Georgia, as in other States, many of the old people—that is, those above 65—have been certified, but the local authorities are unable to raise the money with which to pay them?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; and therefore they are not receiving the benefits.

Mr. ELLENDER. But they have been certified and would be entitled to receive a pension.

Mr. GEORGE. But they are not on the rolls.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand they are not on the rolls, but they would be entitled to the pension if the funds were available.

Mr. GEORGE. Am I to understand that the Senator's amendment or substitute—I am not worried about the parliamentary status of the matter—repeals the existing old-age benefit provision which authorizes matching by the Federal Government up to \$20, if the State puts up the \$20?

Mr. DOWNEY. It eliminates that provision.

Mr. GEORGE. It eliminates that provision; so that this amendment, if adopted, would be in lieu of the existing law on the subject.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire, however, to call the attention of the Senator from California to the fact that while only 2,000,000 aged people are now receiving old-age benefits under existing law, there are many more who are entitled to receive them and would receive them if the States had sufficient funds to match any appropriation from the Federal Government. If the Senator has figures on that subject, I shall be very glad to have him put them in the Record.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. Before yielding to the Senator from Louisiana, I should like first to answer the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia has pointed out an existing condition which I had ignored, but in regard to which I hope I can satisfy his mind.

It is true that in the State of Georgia a year ago for every person who was receiving benefits there were two persons who had been certified who were not receiving them. That has now been cut down to this ratio—that Georgia still has almost but not quite as many persons who have been certified as being needy cases, but who are not receiving pensions, as the number who are receiving them, and let me say to the distinguished Senator that Georgia and two or three other States are unique in that position. In practically all the Western States and the Middle Western States

and the New England States all the needy persons who have been certified are actually receiving payments; and, while I have not the exact figures in mind, I think, taking the United States as a whole, the number of persons who have been certified, but who are not receiving pensions, is less than 10 percent of the whole.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought perhaps the Senator had some figures on the subject. I knew that in my State the statement made was substantially correct, and I had the impression that it was true in many of our neighboring States.

Mr. DOWNEY. It is true in Arkansas; it is true in Mississippi; it is not true in Alabama or in Texas. There are five or six cases in which that is true, but I may say to the distinguished Senator that none of them presents such a case as that of Georgia. I do not know why. The Social Security Board told me—and perhaps the Senator will know the explanation—that in Georgia the number of persons who have been certified for pensions, but are not receiving them, is being very rapidly reduced. Why that is true, I do not know.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Referring to the statement made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], if I correctly understood him, he said that because the Senator from California had classified those between the ages of 60 and 65 as destitute the Senator from California had underestimated the total cost of including them.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am unable to follow that line of reasoning because, if they were classified by the States only as needy instead of destitute, as the Senator from California has classified them, they would receive less benefits. Consequently, the Senator from California has overestimated the amount of money necessary to pay them.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; if the definition of "destitute" and "needy" is correct, I think the Senator from Virginia is correct in his conclusion because I said there were a million destitute persons. The law calls for provision for all those who are needy. His argument is that a person might be needy without being destitute, and hence there would be more needy persons than destitute persons.

Mr. O'DANIEL. But if they are destitute they would draw the full \$30.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If they are needy, that might be very considerably less.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. I think it is merely a moot question, because my figures were prepared by the Social Security Board on the basis of the language used in the amendment and the act itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to the Senator that I am very sympathetic with

his amendment. As a matter of fact, I have had a bill pending before Congress ever since I have been in the Senate, attempting to have the Congress to authorize the Government to put up at least \$20, irrespective of the ability of the States to pay. I suggested a \$30 minimum contribution but reduced it to \$20, in the hope of obtaining sufficient support for its final passage.

Now, reverting to the Senator's amendment, as I understood the Senator a while ago, he stated that the cost to the Government was \$329,000,000 under the existing law.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is the anticipated cost for the next fiscal year.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that if his amendment should prevail, it would then make the cost five, six, or seven hundred million dollars and—

Mr. DOWNEY. More than the expenditure for old-age assistance, plus the expenditure for W. P. A. for people past 60, plus the expenditures for general relief.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the total amount then would be in excess of \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Gross.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is assuming, as the distinguished Senator stated, that the change of the age from 60 to 65 would add a million, and that the two million destitute over 65 now on the rolls would not be increased.

In answer to a question by the Senator from Georgia, as I understood it, the Senator did not take into consideration the thousands of persons above the age of 65 and, of course, those above the age of 60, should his amendment be enacted, who have been certified and who would be subject to certification by the various States and who are unable to obtain their money because of the inability of the States to furnish their pro rata share.

Has the Senator any figures to show the total number of persons who would be eligible under his amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. In the figures prepared for me by the Social Security Board they took into account that if the States were relieved of the necessity of matching, the rolls would be raised by the number who have been certified but are not getting payments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have the figures.

Mr. DOWNEY. I can give the Senator the exact figures. I think I am safe in saying that the total number of persons certified for relief under old-age assistance in the United States, who are not receiving the payments because of lack of funds, is less than 10 percent of the total.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the total number of persons in the United States above 60 years of age is 14,000,000, as I understood the Senator?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I refer to 10 percent of the total number on the rolls.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be 300,000 persons.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; it would be 200,000 persons. That would be 10 percent. Let me point out to the Senator, however, that I am not endeavoring to make any

exact financial statement, because it cannot be done. The very point which was raised by the Senator from Texas, that all of the 3,000,000 would not be entitled to the \$30 a month, is a sound point, which I did not discuss because I did not wish to become too intricate. That would substantially offset the item of which the Senator from Louisiana has spoken, that there are a certain number of persons on the lists certified who are not getting payments.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator's opening statement, he indicated that there are 14,000,000 persons in this country above the age of 60.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And of that number only 20 or 25 percent are in destitute circumstances. Twenty-five percent of 14,000,000 would be about 3,500,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. The present number above 65, who are actually getting the payments, which is the gist of the matter, is 2,000,000 persons.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that not due to the fact that the States are unable to put up sufficient money in order to match the Federal Government, so that all eligibles receive a pension under existing laws?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator happens to come from one of the four or five States which do not, or cannot, give some assistance to all who are certified as in need. These States, therefore, are not matching. Every New England State is matching, every Middle Western State is matching, every Western State is matching.

Mr. ELLENDER. The State of Louisiana is matching for some amount with which I am not familiar at the moment. I came from Louisiana today, and while there I was presented with half a dozen letters addressed by the Louisiana Department of Public Welfare to persons in destitute circumstances, and the letters stated that although they had been certified, there was no money available with which to pay them. I am satisfied that throughout the South the same condition prevails. I am sure it prevails in Texas. I am positive it prevails in Georgia, as the Senator from Georgia has just indicated.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should rather not argue about this; I have all the figures in my office. The Social Security Board has information as to exactly the number of persons who have been certified for relief and who are not receiving payments. Those individuals are only in a few of the Southern States. The State of Georgia has been unique in that I think at one time 200 percent of its eligibles were not receiving payments. That number is being rapidly reduced. There are still four or five Southern States in which the condition prevails. We have as one of our colleagues a former Governor of Texas, who can speak better than I can as to the matter, but I believe Texas is making payments to all who have been certified.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator is correct. The State of Texas is paying those who have been certified, and as more are certified, if additional money is not available, that which is available is merely

prorated among all on the rolls. As soon as persons become certified in the State of Texas, they receive payments of some sort.

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be the situation in Louisiana, but I am not prepared to give the facts. I do know, however, as I have just indicated, that some who had been certified were not on the rolls for any amount.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. DOXEY. I wish to say to the Senator from California that I do not desire to take his time in discussing figures, and conditions, but as a friend of the Senator's amendment, I regard the parliamentary situation rather seriously and as very important in securing the adoption of the amendment. The Senator stated awhile ago, in answer to a question by me, that his reason for offering his amendment as a substitute for the Byrd amendment was that he thought some of those against the Byrd amendment would vote for his amendment. To my mind, that is a two-edged sword; it cuts both ways. There are a number of us inclined to be of assistance to the Senator from California with reference to his amendment. We have helped him, but we cannot vote for it as a substitute for the Byrd amendment, as he has now offered it, because we are endeavoring to go on record in favor of the Byrd amendment.

It looks to me as if the Senator from California would alleviate the situation and simplify matters if he would consider presenting his amendment merely as an amendment to the Byrd amendment, and then those of us who are for the Byrd amendment could vote for the Byrd amendment, and those of us who are for the Senator's amendment could vote for it as an amendment to the Byrd amendment. Then the Byrd amendment and the Senator's amendment both would carry. Certainly the parliamentary situation would be clearer and I think such a course would help carry both amendments. It occurs to me that that would be a simplification from a parliamentary standpoint, that it would keep the record entirely straight, and that it would permit every Senator to express his intentions. Then those who are against the Byrd amendment would have a straight-out vote, and it would not affect the Senator's amendment in any way, shape, or fashion.

I make this suggestion as a friend of both amendments, and I hope that the Senator from California will give my suggestion serious consideration as presenting, from a parliamentary standpoint, the best method in which to proceed. I thank the Senator from California for yielding. I am trying to be helpful and practical in this matter.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his advice, which is very persuasive, and which almost persuades me to do what he suggests. It does look as if that might be the wiser course. I should like to reflect about it a few moments, as the debate proceeds. I am tremendously interested in what the Senator says, because I believe this

amendment would be of immeasurable benefit to his State, and I am glad to know that he is supporting the amendment. I appreciate his attitude immensely.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. A little confusion exists in my mind in connection with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from California in this respect, that notwithstanding the Government, under his proposed amendment, would pay \$30 to each needy person in the United States, the entire \$30 would not necessarily have to be paid. Am I correct in my understanding? In other words, as I understood the Senator, if a needy person was receiving \$10 or \$15 in the way of income, the \$30 could be cut down by that amount.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the State itself held that the standard of living within the State required \$30 a month—and many of the southern Senators take that position—and the recipient was already in receipt of an income of \$15 a month, then it would be within the power of the State to add only \$15 from the Federal allotment to make up the total of \$30.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then the question occurs to me, What happens to the difference between the \$30 that would actually be allotted by the Federal Government and the amount actually paid? Would that be returned to the Federal Government?

Mr. DOWNEY. The State would certify to the Federal Government the number of its needy persons, and the degree of their need. Present records indicate that from 80 to 85 percent of the persons who are eligible would probably get the full amount of \$30. That might not be the condition in the Southern States, because some of the southern Senators are worried lest the payment of too high an income to certain of their citizens might cause social difficulties. The amendment would leave the problem in the hands of the State authorities to determine how much should be paid from the Federal funds up to \$30 a month, and if the State desired to pay anything beyond that, it could do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to make one further suggestion, Mr. President, before I sit down. I know how industriously the distinguished Senator from California has sponsored the proposal of pensions for the old people of the United States. It seems to me he never had a finer opportunity to have his proposal favorably acted upon than he has right now, but it also seems to me that he has complicated the parliamentary situation by offering his proposal as a substitute for the Byrd amendment. I think the Senator from Mississippi, who suggested to the Senator from California that he merely add his proposal to the Byrd amendment, and then have the amendment, as amended, acted upon, offered an opportunity that probably will not come again in many months or years. If the Senator from California could have his amendment added to the Byrd amendment, it would, in my opinion, in that form pass by an overwhelming ma-

jority. I hope the Senator will adopt the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from Utah very much.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am interested in the parliamentary situation, as other Senators are, and I should like, simply for what it is worth, to say to the Senator from California that I cannot see how he would gain anything by attaching his proposal to the Byrd amendment, for his amendment, as I view it, has absolutely nothing to do with the issue involved in the Byrd amendment. I do not think the Senator would get any more votes by offering his amendment as a substitute for the Byrd amendment than he would if it were offered singly and alone on its own merits, nor do I think he would get a single additional vote if he included the Byrd amendment in it. In other words, if the Senator's proposal has merit—and I assume it has or he would not offer it—it seems to me it should stand on its own feet, that it ought to be considered according to its own merits, and that the proper procedure for the Senator to follow in order to secure an accurate test of the sentiment of the Senate on his proposal would be to permit the Byrd amendment to be disposed of, and then to offer his amendment as a separate amendment.

I assume there are Senators who differ on the Byrd amendment, who might be in agreement upon the Senator's amendment, and, conversely, there are Senators who are opposed to his proposal, but who could not vote against it if it were hooked up with the Byrd amendment. Therefore, the result would be a confused situation out of which it seems to me the Senator from California would gain absolutely no parliamentary advantage.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation of the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I should like to state for the RECORD that the data which I am presenting to the Senate were accumulated by our special Old-Age Pension Committee, of which the Senator from Wisconsin was one of the most distinguished and effective members. I can assure him that all the other data I have been using in presenting my figures were laboriously accumulated from the Social Security Board.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from California for his foresight and strategy in getting the old-age-pension proposal before the Senate. I have been here since the 3d of last August. I came here in part for the purpose of trying to assist in getting this tangled old-age-pension matter straightened out, and have not had the opportunity before this time to lend any help whatever.

I considered it useless to introduce a new bill, because so many bills along that line are pending, and it seemed that the Senate always was too busy to consider pensions for the old folks, or to improve the present pension laws for the old folks, until we finally reached the time when the Senate thought of its own Members, and by virtue of the fact that discussion has arisen with respect to pensions for Congressmen the Senator from California now has his opportunity, and has arranged to bring this matter before the Senate. Therefore, I want to extend to him my congratulations, and to let him know that I am wholeheartedly in favor of his proposal in such form as it may be amended or changed to suit some Senators, or the majority of the Senators.

I am also in favor of repealing the feature of the law sought to be repealed by the Byrd amendment. Being in favor of both proposals, it appears to me that the matter is becoming somewhat muddled, and it is going to be difficult for those of us who are in the same position as I to vote our true convictions.

Mr. President, under those conditions I should like also to add my suggestion to the Senator from California that he give us an opportunity to vote on his proposal by making it an amendment to the Byrd amendment. All in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from California would then have an opportunity to express themselves definitely on it, without at the same time expressing themselves against the Byrd amendment. If the Senator's amendment is then carried, which I hope it will be, the opportunity will then recur to vote again on the Byrd amendment, and there is no doubt in my mind that the Byrd amendment will carry by a large majority in this body. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from California is embodied in and is part of the Byrd amendment it is sure, I believe, of adoption. If, however, the amendment of the Senator from California is not adopted as an amendment to the Byrd amendment, the Senator from California will still have the opportunity of offering it as an amendment to the pending bill, H. R. 6446.

Mr. President, I offer that as a suggestion and sincerely trust that the Senator from California will give it his very serious consideration.

I believe it would be detrimental to the best interests of the old folks of this Nation to try and substitute the Downey old-age pension amendment for the Byrd amendment, and I certainly hope that the Senator from California [Mr. Downey] will change it to an amendment to the Byrd amendment, and insist that it be acted on in that position. In my opinion, it will weaken the position of his amendment if he permits it to become separated from the Byrd amendment, because the Byrd amendment is almost sure to be adopted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also hope the distinguished Senator from California will follow the suggestion of the Senator from

Texas. I am one of the 24 Senators who voted against the original Mead bill, and I should not like to be placed in such a position that I could not vote for the repeal of the provision dealing with congressional pensions. I urge the distinguished Senator from California to withdraw his substitute, and to offer his proposal as an amendment to the pending Byrd amendment or as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. The sentiments and opinions expressed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] were those which I had been discussing. It seems to me that from a purely parliamentary standpoint what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] suggested would give an independent vote on the two questions. If the Senator's amendment were offered as an amendment to the Byrd amendment, that would also give an independent vote. I am convinced that the Byrd amendment would help to carry the Senator's proposal. The thought I had in mind when I first asked the distinguished Senator to yield was that if he will offer his amendment as an amendment to the Byrd amendment, those in favor of the Byrd amendment will help to carry his proposal.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield. Mr. President, I am about to break down and come to the mourners' bench if I have an opportunity. [Laughter.]

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us how many persons in the United States are now receiving old-age assistance, how many would be entitled to it under the rules which Congress has established in its aid to the various State funds, and approximately how many persons the Senator feels would be entitled to share in the Treasury benefits which would be paid out under his proposal? I should like to have some fairly clear picture in my mind as to the numbers involved.

Mr. DOWNEY. In round numbers there are approximately 2,000,000 persons past the age of 65 now receiving old-age assistance. In addition, there are 200,000 or 300,000 receiving old-age insurance, but that is something different. If this proposal were adopted, it would bring in approximately 1,000,000 additional persons between the ages of 60 and 65.

Mr. BONE. Then it is a fair assumption that approximately 3,000,000 human beings, men and women, would and could be beneficiaries under the Senator's proposal?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. We should multiply \$30 by that number to obtain some idea of the possible cost of the legislation to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DOWNEY. Thirty dollars times 3,000,000 is \$90,000,000, times 12 months, is something over \$1,000,000,000; but we should be saving an amount in excess of \$300,000,000 which we are now paying out for old-age assistance, plus what we are paying out in connection with the W. P. A.

to those past the age of 65, plus what is being paid out in general relief to persons over the age of 60. Economists say that this plan would increase somewhat the flow of consumptive taxes into the United States Treasury. It is my own thought that the net cost to the people would not be more than \$500,000,000; but I could not guarantee that it would not reach \$600,000,000 or \$700,000,000.

Mr. President, after listening to all this disinterested and able advice I should be very obstinate if I did not yield to it. Therefore, if I am doing the right thing from a parliamentary standpoint, I withdraw the pending amendment in the form of a substitute for the Byrd amendment, and will later offer the amendment which I have at the desk as an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I will withhold that suggestion for a moment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to be bound by what I have said as to how I shall present my next amendment, whether I shall offer it as an amendment to the Byrd amendment or as an amendment to the bill itself.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator is withdrawing his amendment, which will leave the way clear to have a vote very shortly upon the Byrd amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Later he intends to re-offer his amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gillette	Nye
Bailey	Glass	O'Daniel
Ball	Green	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Gurney	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Herring	Radcliffe
Bone	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Holman	Rosier
Brooks	Hughes	Schwartz
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Tobey
Chavez	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, what is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire now to offer as an amendment to the Byrd amendment the proposal I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senate of the United States should at least understand what the pending amendment provides. The Senator from California has not submitted to the Senate a single reliable estimate of the cost of his proposal. What does he propose to do? He proposes to give to the States \$30 for each needy person who is over 60 years of age and let the States—not the Federal Government—determine who are needy. If that is done, I venture the prediction that, under this proposal, a large majority of the 15,000,000 people over 60 years of age will be certified by the States as being needy, because the States will have nothing to pay, but the money will come out of the Federal Treasury.

This amendment, Mr. President, has not been adequately considered by any committee; there has been no report made to the Senate by any committee on it. It is an amendment which incorporates the Townsend plan to give a pension to a majority of the men and women in this country who are over 60 years of age.

In my opinion, Mr. President, we ought to proceed in some orderly way with respect to this proposed gigantic expenditure. I make the confident prediction that if this amendment should be adopted and become a law, it will cost in a short time from \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 a year. It could cost—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD. Let me finish my statement, please. It could perhaps cost \$6,000,000,000 a year if the 15,000,000 citizens of this country who are over 60 years of age were paid \$30 a month. At least 10,000,000 will be certified in my judgment. It does not seem to me the Senate should adopt the Townsend plan in any such hasty manner as this, pursuant to an attempt on the part of the Senator from California to use this repealer measure as a vehicle in an effort to induce the Senate to adopt the Townsend plan.

This is a vital question. We are engaged in the most desperate struggle America has ever known—a struggle which is going to cost untold billions of dollars and many thousands of American lives. It seems to me inconceivable that the Senate should adopt such a measure as that offered by the Senator from California, which has not been even considered by any committee of Congress. We have no estimate of cost; we only have the statement of the Senator from California. I have confidence in him, but I do not have confidence in his estimate as to the cost of this proposed legislation.

We have no written statement from the Social Security Board; nothing has been said indicating what the Board

thinks this proposal, if adopted, would cost. I cannot see it otherwise than that if this proposed legislation, providing the Townsend old-age pension system, giving \$30 a month to those over 60 years of age, and permitting the States to decide who are to receive the benefits should be adopted, a majority of those over 60 years of age would be certified. If one-half of them should be certified—and certainly that is a conservative estimate of the number—then the cost would be \$3,000,000,000 a year, at a time when we should conserve every dollar of non-defense expenditures in order to promote the gigantic war effort which we have undertaken. There has never been a time when we should to a greater extent than now conserve the resources of America.

What is the emergency involved in this matter? America is more prosperous today than it has been for a long time; there is less unemployment than for many years; more money is being spent in different ways in America today than has been spent for a long time. Certainly the present great national emergency should preclude the Congress of the United States from adding 50 percent to the cost of nondefense expenditures of the Government, and, in my opinion, an estimate of \$3,000,000,000 a year as the cost of this pension plan is most conservative.

Mr. President, for the Senator from California to offer as an amendment to a repealer measure of the congressional pensions, I submit, is not in accordance with wise parliamentary procedure. Of course, if it should be adopted, I expect to vote against the repeal measure as amended because I know the repeal measure will pass when it is properly presented to the Senate, and I could never vote for such an expenditure at this time as is involved in the amendment of the Senator from California.

The proposal, I repeat, has not been considered; it has not been reported by any committee; it is simply inconceivable to me that with such hasty consideration, without committee action, the Senate should adopt such an amendment as this.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill. I shall offer the amendment at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we have been discussing a retirement and pension proposal for 2 days. Neither one of the issues that is to be decided this afternoon appears to be so important as the matter I am about to speak of. I shall not discuss the proposal to give elderly persons pensions of \$30 a month; neither shall I discuss whether a person should attain the age of 60 or 65 in order to receive a pension from the National Government. I shall discuss a different kind of question; I shall discuss the boys in the Philippines who are getting \$21 a month, and who daily face the hazard of being killed while drawing that munificent sum.

Mr. President, on Friday last the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]

made what, in my opinion, will prove to be one of the historic and renowned speeches on the conduct of the war. His address thrilled the Nation, or at least, that majority that is grateful for the noble and patriotic defense that is being put forth by General MacArthur and his brave soldiers in the Bataan Peninsula and Corregidor in the Philippine Islands. The Senator spoke of courageous deeds such as would inspire men in any age. He reminded the country again that General MacArthur and his men are carrying on a fight against superior forces with the indomitable courage that has always been exhibited when the armed forces of the country have been put to the test.

He pleaded that our Government do everything in its power to try to rush aid for the relief of our forces in the Philippines. He asked that troops and materials of war be conveyed by our Navy, at whatever hazard, to the Philippine Islands. His plea has met with a ready response from the whole country, and in no State with a greater degree of approval than in my State of New Mexico.

In addition to patriotic reasons, the people of my State are deeply concerned with the actual military situation in the Philippines. They are in complete accord with the suggestions made by the Senator from Maryland. Thousands of mothers, relatives, and friends of New Mexico boys in the Philippines are interested. They have personal reasons and they cannot see any particular logic or advantage in a military way of sending troops to the four corners of the world while their sons, and sons of other American mothers from other States, are not aided. They fail to understand why an attempt is not made by this Government to aid them in an effective way.

Daily I have received letters, telegrams, and personal visits from constituents who have relatives in the Philippines, asking what Uncle Sam is doing about their sons and our soldiers. It is impossible to point out to a mother in my State that it is more advantageous to send soldiers to Aruba, soldiers to Ireland, soldiers to Iceland, soldiers to Java, equipment and war matériel to Libya and Russia, than it is to send soldiers, bombers, guns, and artillery on their way to the Philippine Islands where they are so badly needed.

Some few days ago, approximately 200 mothers, wives, and sisters of New Mexico soldiers in the Philippines consulted with one another in the little city of Deming, not far from the Mexican border, in my State. It was decided that they would send one of their group to Washington to make personal inquiries as to what this Government was doing, or attempting to do, to bring effective aid to their sons. Mrs. L. H. Byrne, a noble and patriotic woman of my State, who has an 18-year-old boy—her baby—proudly serving this country in the Bataan Peninsula, for the first time in her life got on an airplane and came to the city of Washington to make due inquiries as to what we were doing. In my presence she was received courteously by officers of the War Department, who gave her encouragement but nothing definite that would relieve her and her neighbors

of the anguish that they quite naturally feel.

Daily I receive letters and telegrams, pleading with me to see that something is done in the way of effective relief. The mothers of the New Mexico soldiers in the Philippines know American history. I am sure the mothers of the other soldiers with MacArthur also know our history. They know that up to this war our troops, the marines and the Navy of the United States, have carried the war to the enemy, even as against odds and handicaps. We have never been on the defensive; and, like the proverbial Irishman, we have always "waded into them." These mothers cannot see why a rich and powerful country, which can plan with plenty of confidence to produce 45,000 planes in 1 year, cannot send a few bombers to the Philippines. I know that they feel that if this country can send thousands of tanks and planes to help Russia, and thousands of tanks and planes to help the Allied forces in Libya, a few tanks and bombers sent to MacArthur would mean the difference between defeat and driving the Japanese from Luzon Island.

The country is demanding action. The people know we are at war, and they know that war is everything Sherman said it was. They know that it means suffering, that it means spilling blood, that it means broken hearts, that it means the death of our loved ones; but the people of the country are willing, the soldiers, sailors, and marines are ready to make the supreme sacrifice if need be, in order to bring relief to their brothers in arms who are in need. Now is the time to repeat the past. Now is the time to repeat the action of hundreds of efforts made heretofore by our Army and our Navy in bold and brave adventure. Now is the time to do something. As stated before, there is not a person in the entire United States who does not feel that General MacArthur needs help. MacArthur himself would prefer a few attack planes to having all the streets in Washington named after him. He is one of our own, and so are the thousands who are fighting under him. Uncle Sam is the guardian of these soldiers. In everyday life, how many times have we heard of the mother who will go into the flaming room, even in the greatest of danger, in order to protect and save her child? Is Uncle Sam going to do as much for his boys now in a flaming hell in the Philippines?

I am going to read two or three letters from mothers of my State expressing how they feel about this matter.

Here is a letter from a small country town called Mesilla Park, in southern New Mexico:

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I saw in the paper where Senator MILLARD TYDINGS is asking that reinforcements be sent Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces in Bataan. I think our New Mexico representatives should back this move, as many of New Mexico's boys are in the Bataan Peninsula. If we have forces to send other places, surely we have forces to reinforce our American boys. If we cannot equip and reinforce them, surely we should make an effort to bring them home. No one in our Nation has a right to set our own boys as a suicide squad and continue to give assistance to other nations. From articles appearing, it

appears that one of them laid down, and her leaders have failed in every crucial test. I suggest more assistance to Russia, for they are actually fighting our enemy.

We New Mexico people are following this with keen interest and many tears. We'd like to know your reaction on this matter.

Here is another letter, from a young lady who has a 19-year-old brother in the Philippine Islands. It is from Hanover, N. Mex., which is also a small country town. The letter does not come from a big city, where people are willing to serve the Government and leave everything they have so long as they can get a place in Washington. This letter comes from a family in a small country town in my State who know what is needed and who go to the recruiting officers and enlist:

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Just want to add my plea for help to reach MacArthur's men in the Philippine Islands before it is too late. Please do all in your power to have at least a few bombers reach them. We feel like the United States is letting them down there. Are we?

I have a brother in the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery, and I want him back like he was sent over there, sound in mind and body; and unless they get them help immediately, what can we expect?

Trusting you to do all you can—

Here is another letter from a small country town, but from a Christian, patriotic American mother:

I write to you regarding our troops in the Philippine Islands. About 10 weeks they have been in desperate straits on Luzon Island. What do you suppose those faithful men think we are doing here? If they could read the papers they would be very much disgusted with some of the doings in Washington, dissension, waste of time, and bombastic talk, and seemingly nothing done to relieve the Philippine situation. It looks like we are sold out to the British; at least, many people think that way. War equipment is being sent everywhere else. If the United States has a fleet, why can't planes be sent MacArthur as well as to every other war front? Hundreds of New Mexico boys and officers are there. Can't you and other Members of Congress act now and do something for MacArthur and his brave men? I do hope you will use your influence—

I thank the lady for the compliment—at once for that purpose.

Hopefully and respectfully,

From another small country town, a lady writes me as follows:

My son was a member of the National Guard [in New Mexico], which was inducted into the Army, and last September was sent to the Philippines, while members of the Regular Army are still in the United States. That doesn't seem right to me, and I don't understand it; besides that, they were hurried away ill-equipped, and better equipment has never been sent them. Now they are left fighting after more than 2 months with no material aid or reinforcements from their country; and I consider their country has failed to back them up, and is no longer interested in them, since they leave them to fight until there is no alternative but to surrender, like the gallant boys of Wake Island.

The boys of the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery represent some of our best educated and cultured citizens, and have families who need them badly. My boy is more precious than the whole group of the Philippines, and yet they have sent reinforcements to the East Indies to protect the oil interests. I believe they should try to evacuate those troops

if they are not going to send them aid, and it will take three times as many men to regain their present positions. I know we were not properly prepared, in spite of talking about it the last year or two, owing to allowing the laborers to strike. Why shouldn't the soldiers strike for better pay or their country's support? Now there is a silly plan to teach children defense dancing when they may be crying for bread or their own fathers soon.

What a selfish world this has grown to be, when our Senators take advantage of the situation to feather their nests through our pockets.

I believe she was discussing the pending question.

There seems to be no justice any more. From my standpoint our Government is top-heavy in personnel, and money-mad, and I fear we will be bankrupt when this war is over, and then what will happen? Too much red tape, too much politics, inefficient people in positions of authority. We need people who are honest, with the good of our country at heart. I wish we could clean out all the selfishness and start over again.

I desire to advise the lady that next November is a good time to start.

Our Government has failed our soldiers miserably; but can't something really be done to help our boys in the Philippines before it is too late?

Mr. President, Clovis, N. Mex., is a small city, an enterprising, vigorous city, with a population consisting of Americans, the kind who join the Army, not the kind who come to Washington to get commissions as majors, or become specialists. I am proud today that from the home city of my colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who I wish were present, some 200 or 300 boys are in the Philippines. I hold in my hand a telegram from the chairman of a committee of fathers and mothers of that city, reading as follows:

CLOVIS, N. MEX., January 7, 1942.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fathers, mothers, and friends of New Mexico troops now fighting with back to wall in Philippine Islands are very fearful of their survival if something not done at once by our War Department to give them immediate relief by added troops and supplies or evacuate them. We wish your assurance that measures are being taken for these men. Clovis and New Mexico probably have larger percent of men in Philippines than any other region. Is our Government going to permit these New Mexico men to die like rats in a trap without relief 8,000 miles from home?

COMMITTEE OF FATHERS AND MOTHERS,
By P. E. JORDAN.

To show the Senate that that feeling is prevalent not only in New Mexico but elsewhere, I wish to read a letter which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, written by a good lady of the city of Washington, as follows:

HELP, NOT GLORY

They are naming a street in Washington for MacArthur; squabbling over whether they will call it a road or a boulevard; quite characteristic of our war effort in this city. What cares MacArthur about a street named for him here in Washington? He and his men need everything—planes, reinforcements, supplies—and we give him an epitaph. Name a street for him and sit back in our smugness and prattle about the honor we have shown

him. His men are dying out there, bravely upholding the finest traditions of our country, with just a glimmering ray of hope that somehow, before it is too late, Uncle Sam will do the right thing by them. Those were fine words that our President spoke right after Pearl Harbor to the defenders of the Philippines. Hold on and we will help you. Everyone knows how they held on. In the meantime reinforcements reach Ireland.

The best defense is an attack. Who said that? Not the men in Washington. By now surely we must be turning out 2,000 bombers a month, flying fortresses, some of them. Are there no red-blooded men in the air forces of the Army or Navy who would volunteer to fly just a few token long-range bombers by stages to MacArthur? Are there not a few red-blooded men in command who will give the orders?

AN AMERICAN MOTHER.

WASHINGTON, February 14.

Mr. President, I have many letters of a similar nature and import, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESILLA PARK, N. MEX.,
February 14, 1942.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
of New Mexico,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I saw in the paper where Senator MILLARD TYDINGS is asking that reinforcements be sent Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces in Bataan. I think our New Mexico representatives should back this move, as many New Mexico's boys are in the Bataan. If we have forces to send other places, surely we have forces to reinforce our American boys. If we can't equip and reinforce them, surely we should make an effort to bring them home. No one in our Nation has the right to set our own boys as a suicide squad and continue to give assistance to England. From outside appearance, England laid down and her leaders have failed in every crucial test. I suggest more assistance to Russia, for they are actually fighting our enemy.

We New Mexico people are following this with keen interest and many tears. We'd like to know your reaction on this matter.

Yours truly,

Mrs. W. E. EVANS.

HANOVER, N. MEX., February 15, 1942.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Just want to add my plea for help to reach MacArthur's men in the Philippines before it is too late. Please do all in your power to have at least a few bombers reach them. We feel like the United States is letting them down there. Are we?

I have a brother in the Two Hundredth C. A., and I want him back like he was sent over there, sound in mind and body; and unless they get them help immediately, what can we expect?

Trusting you to do all you can, I am,
Sincerely,

GERTIE G. ALLAN.

FEBRUARY 16, 1942.

Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senator from New Mexico.
DEAR SENATOR: I write to you regarding our troops in the Philippines. About 10 weeks they have been in desperate straits on Luzon Island. What do you suppose those faithful men think we are doing here? If they could read the papers they would be very much dis-

gusted with some of the doings in Washington. Dissension, waste of time, and bombastic talk, and seemingly nothing done to relieve the Philippine situation. It looks like we are sold out to the British—at least many people think that way. War equipment is being sent everywhere else. If the United States has a fleet, why can't planes be sent MacArthur as well as to every other war front? Hundreds of New Mexico boys and officers are there. Can't you and other Members of Congress act now and do something for MacArthur and his brave men? I do hope you will use your influence at once for that purpose.

Hopefully and respectfully, I am your friend,

Mrs. JUNE ROBERTSON.

DEMING, N. MEX.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., Feb. 7, 1942.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAVEZ: We, as father and mother of a son (our only son) fighting in the Philippine Islands, are wondering why after 62 days of hard fighting there has been no help sent the boys there, at least to give them a breathing spell. We believe we are expressing the sentiment of hundreds of New Mexico fathers and mothers that have sons in the Philippines. And just why is there nothing being done for them? If we have men and equipment to send to Ireland and other places surely we can send help to our own American boys stranded on a remote island with no help at all. We know and appreciate that there is a war to win, and to win it we know that it means all-out of everything, but we do believe that the safety and protection of our own boys come first.

We do not know who to go to but you Mr. CHAVEZ, for you do represent us New Mexico people, and we are hoping and praying that something can be done for our boys.

I have had no word from my son since war started, we don't know whether he is dead or alive.

He is Lt. Charles R. Sparks of Forty-first Infantry.

Hoping you can do something for us.

We are,

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. L. V. SPARKS.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
January 5, 1942.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If you have any influence at all, please use it to get something done about sending help to the New Mexico boys in the Philippines.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. A. COGGESHALL.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
January 5, 1942.

Mr. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

DEAR MR. CHAVEZ: We have a mothers' club here in Albuquerque of all the boys in the Philippines. From what they tell us, looks like some of the officers are leaving the Philippines because it is getting tough for them, and we want to ask you if you can't do something about getting our boys out, too. We notice in papers that boys are fighting against big odds. Please, Mr. CHAVEZ, forgive me for my poor writing.

Only one of your friends whom you don't know.

VICENT LUERAS.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., January 3, 1942.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I am writing to you, as I am very anxious to find out something in regard to our boys from New Mexico who are in the Philippines.

Two things are most important: First, why have they had no reinforcements? Also, why were the boys past 28 years of age shipped out of the United States when the bill had already been passed by Congress to release them?

I realize they would all be called back now, but why were they sent and kept in the Philippines, where they still are?

All the New Mexico people are anxiously wondering why some help by sea or air isn't available to General MacArthur and his army.

I would appreciate your efforts to help secure this aid our boys so badly need.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours very truly,

MARGARETTE WILLIAMS.

628 SOUTH WALTER STREET,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., January 4, 1942.
The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: More than 2,000 New Mexico boys and more from other States are facing annihilation in the Philippines by the overwhelming odds of Japanese soldiers. According to recent magazines and news reports, no attempt is planned to relieve these boys, and, instead, all aid is being sent to Singapore and Netherlands. These reports are causing a feeling of intense anxiety bordering on panic among the relatives and friends of these boys. Can assurance be given that any effort will be made to rescue these soldiers immediately; not eventually?

Very truly yours,

Mrs. FRED E. LANDON.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
January 3, 1942.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator from New Mexico,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your insistence that reinforcements be rushed to the relief of those valiant heroes fighting in the Philippines will be greatly appreciated by thousands of parents in New Mexico. My son is fighting side by side with some of your family. They need help and your efforts in their and our behalf will be most important.

Frankly, I do not like Mr. Churchill. He is all for the British. Since we have so much to send to them and others it seems reasonable to expect some for our own.

How those who have no sons facing the enemy in Japanese uniforms can expect high morale in the rest of our armed forces when they know they will be deserted—yes, cold-bloodedly deserted—by those they trusted when they enlisted or answered the selective service call, is more than I can understand. Maybe if my son was strutting around safely in this country I would feel otherwise. As it is I can't help but question the motives of some in high places. I feel that there has been some un-American wool pulling.

Please, Senator, won't you do your best? That will be plenty.

Respectfully yours,

V. H. SPENSLEY.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., January 3, 1942
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Sentiment in Albuquerque is very strong over the seeming inability of our Government to protect our soldiers in the field.

From the time of the tragic affair on Wake Island, when everyone expected help for our Pacific outposts, up to the present time when our boys in the Philippines are fighting with their backs against the wall, it would seem that a terrible mistake has been made somewhere.

I serve in several organizations; also on three of our civic boards. The opinion is

unanimous—that we should demand that something be done for our boys in the Philippines.

So far we have overlooked the fact that no help has been sent on account of the distance but we want assurance that our Government is not going to let us down and will get aid to our men in the Philippines at once.

We are true Americans and we do not object to our boys fighting for their country—but we do object to our boys being sacrificed to save time for additional fortification of Singapore.

We have always felt that if we were in trouble, our Navy, our planes, and our men would protect us. Our boys in the Philippines are protecting our country now. Is Washington going to refuse to protect them?

Hoping that you may be of assistance in getting word to us that reinforcements are on the way, I am,

Yours very sincerely

ETHEL M. BICKFORD.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., January 6, 1941.
Senator D. CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As parents of a son in the Philippine Islands, we are writing to you, asking what is being done to reinforce the men there, or if there are any plans to evacuate the troops.

We see in the papers here about taking General MacArthur off if it gets too hard going to hold the island. We pride ourselves on being as good Americans as there are in the United States of America, but we want some assurance that this United States of America will treat our men as they deserve to be treated. We think it unfair to send them there if they have no plans to reinforce them or evacuate them. They should not be left to fight to the last man, just to gain the English more time to reinforce Singapore.

If you can, please send some encouraging news to the Albuquerque papers. They drafted our son for 1 year, and was not to be sent out of the United States of America, but if they give him a chance to pull out if necessary to give up the Philippine Islands, and not left there for the Japs, that's all we ask.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. F. O. BERGQUIST.

JANUARY 8, 1942.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Please use your influence in convincing the Army and Navy officials that the Philippine defenders should not be left to die in the defense of Singapore without some effort to aid them.

It is neither fair to the boys over there or to the ones who love them over here to sell their lives for time to prepare to fight.

Let's see some moves made to evacuate them or send them reinforcements instead of making them the goat—scapegoat of our unpreparedness.

Trusting yours,

GLENN BERGQUIST.

P. S.: Yes, I have a brother over there.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., January 5, 1942.
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We want our boys in Philippines either reinforced or evacuated and keep MacArthur with them.

MR. AND MRS. F. O. BERQUIST.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., January 3, 1942.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ.

DEAR SIR: I wish at this time to beg for help for our soldiers in the Philippines.

Is it necessary to send all reinforcements to Singapore and Dutch East Indies while our boys are being murdered without a chance?

A heartbroken mother who is praying for justice for our boys.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. H. E. FINCKE.

(Mothers' Service Club.)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., January 6, 1942.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The people of New Mexico are much concerned over the possible fate of our 2,000 boys in the Philippines and will appreciate some assurance that they are not to be abandoned without some direct efforts to relieve their present situation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CARL F. WHITTAKER.

DEMING, N. MEX., February 12, 1942.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My son was a member of the National Guard which was inducted into the Army, and last September was sent to the Philippines, while members of the Regular Army are still in the United States. That doesn't seem right to me, and I don't understand it. Besides that, they were hurried away ill-equipped, and better equipment has never been sent to them.

Now they are left fighting, after more than 2 months, with no material aid or reinforcements from their country, and I consider their country has failed to back them up, and is no longer interested in them, since they leave them to fight until there is no alternative but to surrender like the gallant boys of Wake Island.

The boys of the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery represent some of our best-educated and cultured citizens, and have families who need them badly.

My boy is more precious than the whole group of Philippines, and yet they have sent reinforcements to the East Indies to protect the oil interests.

I believe they should try to evacuate those troops if they are not going to send them aid, and it will take three times as many men to regain their present positions.

I know we were not properly prepared, in spite of talking about it the last year or two, owing to allowing the laborers to strike. Why shouldn't the soldiers strike for better pay or their country's support? Now there is a silly plan to teach children defense dancing when they may be crying for bread or their own fathers soon.

What a selfish world this has grown to be when our Senators take advantage of the situation to feather their nests through our pockets.

There seems to be no justice any more. From my standpoint, our Government is top-heavy in personnel and money-mad, and I fear we will be bankrupt when this war is over, and then what will happen? Too much red tape, too much politics, inefficient people in positions of authority; we need people who are honest, with the good of our country at heart.

I wish we could clean out all the selfishness and start over again.

Our Government has failed our soldiers miserably, but can't something really be done to help our boys in the Philippines before it is too late? It will cause a blot on our history.

Respectfully,

Mrs. FRED SHERMAN.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to express to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] the sincere thanks of thousands of mothers from my State for his noble courage in expressing their desires and their feelings. I want to assure the Senator from Maryland that I feel exactly as he does.

I hope that actual deeds, in the way of reinforcements and conveying to the Philippines, will be ordered. Talks, speeches, magazine articles, newspaper interviews, photos in the newspapers at home—none of these will help General MacArthur and his gallant army.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reverting to the remarks made a few moments ago by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I have no desire to enter into a controversy with him as to whether the pending proposal is the Townsend plan. I can assure him it is not. It is totally different in its scope and operation, in its beneficiaries and cost, and in the method of raising money. But, regardless of what the Senator may desire to call it, the ultimate question is, how much would it cost our people?

The Senator stated unequivocally that I had no official data here supporting my remarks. I know he was sincere in that statement, but he was incorrect. I happen to have been the chairman of a special committee to investigate old age pensions, which was in session for many weeks, and received voluminous data after exhaustive research by the Social Security Board. I may state that those data were all presented to the Finance Committee of the Senate, and are now on file, and that I myself personally presented to the Finance Committee the data upon the very proposal now before the Senate, with the documents supporting it. If the Senator will go to the records of his own committee, he will find there the documentary data supporting the statements I have made.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from California state that that documentary evidence refers to a \$30-a-month pension, paid solely by the Federal Government?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes. I placed in the record, I think the last time I appeared before the Committee on Finance, figures as to the cost to the Federal Government of a \$30-a-month pension, as given to me by the Social Security Board.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator present the figures to the Senate now?

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not have them here, but I have other records in my hand.

Mr. BYRD. What the Senator has now is figured on an entirely different basis.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator from Virginia will permit me to inform the Senate what I have here, I think the Senate will be satisfied.

I asked the Social Security Board to present data to me as to the number of persons between 60 and 65 years of age who would probably be eligible for, and would claim, the pension of \$30 a month. I likewise asked the Social Security Board to state for me their estimate of the number of persons above 65 years of age who would be eligible and who would claim the pension in the event the Federal Government made a flat contribution of \$30 a month, without any matching by the States.

The Social Security Board informed me that there were certain factors involved of quite an uncertain nature, and that they therefore had to give me alternative estimates. The uncertainty arose from the fact that they did not know the number of persons who would continue in employment in the event the pension were provided.

Some of their actuaries thought that of the age group between 60 and 64 years of age, 15 percent would be needy persons, unemployed, without children, without savings, and would be entitled to, and would claim, the pension which I have proposed in the amendment. Some of their actuaries thought it would be 17½ percent; some of them thought it might go as high as 20 percent, and one actuary told me that, in order to be entirely safe, they had made an estimate also of the percentage of the persons between 60 and 65 years of age who might claim pensions, and that the figure might go up to 24 percent of the total.

If 15 percent, the minimum number, should claim the pension, the total number would be 2,900,000. If 17 percent, which was the most generally accepted figure, should claim the pension, the number would be 3,029,000. If 20 percent were to claim the pension, 3,147,000 would be eligible, and if 24 percent were to claim the pension, 3,300,000 would be eligible under the law.

I have been informed by the actuaries of the Social Security Board that war employment is reducing the number of unemployed and the number of needy persons between 60 and 65 years of age, and that probably the lower percentage of eligible persons should be accepted. I have not done that. I have not only taken a medium figure but I have allowed an extra hundred million to cover that contingency, if necessary.

I may also state to any distinguished Senator who is interested that these figures apprehend that all the persons who are certified as needy will receive their payments.

Knowing, under the figures of the Social Security Board, that approximately 3,000,000 persons would be eligible under the needy clause, it then becomes rather a simple matter of arithmetic to multiply \$30 a month by 3,000,000 persons by 12 months, with a resulting figure approximating \$1,000,000,000.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia has rather shocked me by his suggestion that if this measure providing relief for needy persons should be passed, then everyone in the United States, employed and unemployed, millionaire and pauper, United States Senators and Representatives, would claim the pension. I cannot believe that there would be any public officials so corrupt and stupid as to allow that. I think the Senator has been drawn into an extraordinary statement.

I may say that the present Social Security Act, in my opinion, very carefully safeguards the standards that must be applied by a State in determining who is a needy person. The Federal Security Agency holds it within its own power to prescribe certain rules safeguarding the actions of the States. I have no reason to believe that the States would be cor-

rupt and would grant this pension to persons who were not in need; but if such a situation should develop, there is ample power in the Federal Government under the present Social Security Act to apply a remedy. If the distinguished Senator from Virginia does not think that to be so, I shall be very glad to have him prepare an amendment to my amendment which would safeguard in any way he desires the payment of these pensions, so that they would go only to needy persons.

I may say that in one or two or three States there have been complaints made that pensions were paid to an excessive number of persons, some of whom were not in need. I believe the Social Security Board has met that problem and solved it. I have no doubt it would be solved if the age limit were reduced to 60 years.

It seems to me that an argument based upon the assumption that the law will be disobeyed and not carried out is weak, indeed. When by solemn congressional enactment we are assuring pensions to persons in need it seems strange for the distinguished Senator from Virginia to say, "I am going to calculate the cost in billions of dollars, because I say that every American citizen, above 60 years of age, Henry Ford and Franklin Roosevelt, whomsoever he may be, will claim this pension." It seems to me the Senator is going far afield in making such an argument.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I never said they would claim it. I said it would be possible under the law for them to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. It certainly would not be possible. No man could get this pension unless he showed need. A United States Senator receiving \$10,000 a year cannot show need. A man with employment cannot show need. A man with a home or a job, or even if he does not have a job, if he has children to support him, cannot show need. The law has already been faithfully and well carried out. There has been no violation of it. Why, I ask the Senator, simply because we would relieve 1,000,000 people in the tragic age between 60 and 65 years, does he believe there would be a break-down of the law?

Mr. BYRD. One of the reasons that the law has been more strictly enforced is that up to this date a State pays one-half of the pension. The Senator now proposes that the Federal Government pay all of it, but to permit the States to fix the standards on the basis of which it will be paid.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator is very much mistaken in that assumption. I am not suggesting that the States be allowed to fix the standards. I am leaving the law as it is at present, and the Social Security Board has ample power under the present law to see that no State shall unfairly define the meaning of "needy." The distinguished Senator is a member of the Finance Committee, and if he believes that the provisions of the law prescribing how the qualifications of needy persons shall be determined and safeguarded are not sufficient, it will be very simple for him to offer an

amendment to the law and have it adopted, without any difficulty, by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from California stated, I believe, in connection with the figures read by him, that they were made on a basis of 80 percent and 20 percent; in other words, 80 percent to be paid by the Federal Government and 20 percent to be paid by the States. The proposal which the Senator now makes is that 100 percent shall be paid by the Federal Government, and that nothing shall be paid by the States. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; the Senator is only confusing the situation in a very unhappy way. I read no figures from the statement with respect to money. I read merely the number of persons between the ages of 60 and 65.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will read the letter from the Board it will be seen that the statement is made on the 80-20 basis.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to clarify the situation to the Senate. I requested the Social Security Board to tell me what would be the cost to the Federal Government of a pension plan under which \$40 a month flat would be paid to all single persons in the United States, and \$25 to each of a married couple, if of the total amount 80 percent should be paid by the Federal Government and 20 percent by the States. It is true that the figures I have given as to the number of needy persons appear in that statement, but I have not read any figures relating to a \$40-a-month pension or to 80 percent being paid by the Federal Government and 20 percent by the States.

Mr. BYRD. The point I was trying to make is that the particular plan which the Senator now proposes has not been submitted to the Social Security Board and that the figures he is reading are based on a different plan.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to state to the Senator again, and I do so at the risk of boring the Senate, that I requested of the Social Security Board an estimate of the number of persons who would be entitled to the \$30 a month on the basis of need. I hold the Board's reply in my hand. Their statement is the number would be approximately 3,000,000. The Social Security Board has said repeatedly to me in different forms—and this is one of them—that it could be expected that under a pension law giving pensions to needy persons past the age of 60, the number of persons would be about 3,000,000. I may say to the distinguished Senator that from there on I did not need any Social Security Board figures. If the Social Security Board tells me "You are going to have 3,000,000 beneficiaries," and the Senate decides to pay them \$30 a month each, I do not have to go to any actuaries to multiply 3,000,000 by \$30 a month. I know myself that the figure would be \$90,000,000, and I know there are 12 months in the year, and I can multiply \$90,000,000 by 12 and find a total of about \$1,000,000,000, which is just about what the cost would be. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I discussed this very set of figures before the Finance

Committee, and put the documents in the record to support them.

Mr. President, let me say that if it should develop hereafter that any of the States were lax or corrupt in enforcing the rule as to needy persons, then of course the Congress of the United States, if it were necessary, could give additional power to the Social Security Board.

The fact is that it would take something over \$1,000,000,000 to implement this plan; but there would be about \$500,000,000 in credits, representing the savings in present pensions, W. P. A., and general relief, leaving a net cost to the Government of between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000, or \$700,000,000.

Mr. President, I shall conclude very briefly. A few months ago the Gallup organization completed a great poll of this Nation. It found that 91 percent of the American people favor Federal pensions; that an overwhelming majority want the age fixed at 60; and that the median amount desired by the people of the United States is \$42.

Under the proposal which I am offering \$30 a month would be paid by the Federal Government, and the State could rest upon that if it so desired, or it could add an additional amount to it. I cannot believe that any Senator from the South, representing one of the States where the consequences have been most tragic in relation to the social-security law, will not vote for this measure, because it would tend to equalize the flow of money out of the United States Treasury to all the States upon a fair and equitable basis.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter or two, and then I shall conclude. When the Social Security Board tells us that there are in the United States approximately 1,000,000 needy people between the ages of 60 and 64 it means persons without jobs, without savings, without property, and without children to support them. It means individuals eating the bitter bread of poverty in this wealthy land under conditions so miserable and unhappy that any man who pretends to adhere to Christian principles should feel a sense of revulsion. While we pretend to moral leadership of the world and propose to spread to the world everywhere the "four freedoms," including freedom from want, in our own country there are millions of elderly men and women desperate and unhappy. I cannot live in Washington easy and soft and well fed and enjoy life knowing that in my own State and everywhere else in the United States are hungry, despairing people.

The passage of the measure which I propose would not impede our war effort at all. I say that because the people I have in mind do not want planes, steel, guns, and battleships; they want food to live on. If our farmers cannot produce the food for them, plus whatever we eat, then let some of the others of us give up 1 or 2 percent of our food so that it may be given to them and so that in this Christian land we shall not have misery and despair.

Mr. President, I know these elderly citizens. They represent the pioneer type of America. They built this land. Many

of them accumulated for decades against old age and saw their savings engulfed in the panic of 1929. Yes; they are the people who built our productive instruments and cleared and planted our farms.

Now, through no fault or failure of their own, they are reduced to a tragic condition. I cannot understand how any Senator could fail immediately to seek to rescue them from their unhappy plight.

Mr. President, perhaps more than any other Senator I am harassed by the receipt of letters which, when I read them, tear my very heart. I have received hundreds of thousands of such letters in the 3 years I have been here telling of the misery, insecurity, and degradation of great segments of our population. I wish to read two of those letters, which are typical, and with that conclude my argument on this amendment, unless the distinguished Senator from Virginia desires to raise some additional points.

In November of last year I received this letter from Los Angeles:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 12, 1941.
Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
Claremont, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I read in the Los Angeles Examiner a publication by Mr. Joseph Timmons, in which he states that you will sponsor an initiative measure for the next November ballot for a \$60 per month pension for persons 60 years old or more not gainfully employed. I am glad to know that you are interested in the aged. My husband for one would appreciate knowing that he can get help. His name is Patrick Henry. He was injured on a Work Projects Administration project in 1939, has not been able to work since.

He is eligible for the pension now, and would be very grateful for it.

That is, he is past the age of 60.

He gets some help, but his check for the month of October was cut \$9.27 and we don't have food in the house. I am not able to go out to work, as there is no one to care for him, and it is hard on me to have his check cut. He had to carry the water hose on his right shoulder, when at work, which paralyzed his right side. Our President says nobody should go hungry but we are. Will thank you kindly for a reply.

Respectfully,

BLANCHE HENRY (wife).

Then a despairing note which gives the details of this typical tragedy:

Mr. DOWNEY. All they give us is \$29.68, and \$9.27 was taken out of that, so all I had left was \$2.15 to buy food with after I paid my rent—was \$15 and gas and light was \$3.27, and all they send me was \$20 October 17, the check was due on the 15th.

Rent-----	\$15.00
Gas and light-----	3.27
Total-----	18.27

So you see Mr. DOWNEY what I had left out of \$20, only \$2.15 to take care of my sick husband with, so I thought I would write you, Mr. DOWNEY, because I knew you are over them at the relief office and they have to do what you say. For I am really in need. I have no food in the house for almost 3 weeks and no money to buy food with. I thank you again Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

Mr. President, one of the terrifying things about these letters is their meekness. Very seldom is there any hatred, condemnation, fury, or passion. There is only the cry for help. These people are

on the verge of destitution and starvation.

Let me read a second letter. I could read such letters from my files by the month if anybody would listen to me. This letter was written on Thanksgiving Day:

MODESTO, CALIF., November 20, 1941.
Mr. SHERIDAN DOWNEY.

DEAR SIR: Just a few lines this Thanksgiving Day. Most everyone around here seems to be gone to dinner somewhere, all but poor me. I am here all alone, out of money, out of everything to eat again. I pay my house rent, \$15 a month, and water bill and gas bill and other little expenses. It don't leave me enough to live on until the 1st of the next month.

I am 72 years old. My right leg has been broken twice and almost every rib has been broken in a wreck. I am not able to work any. I make a loaf of bread do me a week. A small sack of potatoes a month. The last of the month, the last 2 weeks, I live on one meal a day. If I want to go to town I have to walk 2 miles as I haven't got the 10 cents to pay the bus fare. I am out of money, out of things to eat, and 10 more days to go.

This morning I thought someone maybe would bring me something to eat, but haven't as yet and it is 2 o'clock. I worked hard to help elect you and Governor Olson. Now will you please give us old people a pension?

I am satisfied there is thousands of old people all over this United States that needs help. Enact the Townsend plan. Give it a trial and see if it will work.

Give this letter to the one where it will do the most good.

Yours respectfully,

H. J. MUSSER.

Oh, Mr. President, the picture of silent despair, of an old man all alone in a house at Thanksgiving, waiting, pitifully hoping that some relative will come by and perhaps give him a meal. Oh, if that were a single case, and if any Senator knew about it, he would draw a check to help that person. But, Mr. President, I speak from knowledge personal and certain when I tell you that millions of the elderly people of this Nation are on the verge of misery and starvation.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered does not satisfy my longing for decent social dividends; but it will at least alleviate the tragic plight of millions of our people past 60 years of age, people too old to work, without savings, and without children. I sometimes think that if this Nation and our civilization are to endure we had best begin to think about the afflicted and the unfortunate persons within the borders of our own land, and endeavor as best we can to alleviate their misery.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from California has now withdrawn his amendment as a substitute for the Byrd amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. And that he now offers it as an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. To the Byrd amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes; but to the pending bill; is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Let me inquire of the Senator why he saw fit to do so?

Mr. DOWNEY. Principally because 20 or 25 Senators suggested that I do so, and assured me it would have their support if I did so.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. So that if the Senator's amendment is agreed to—and I rather think it will be—and then the so-called Byrd amendment as amended is agreed to, the so-called congressional pensions will be out, and the Senator's proposal will be in. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. If that happens the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I will have joint responsibility in bringing pensions to a great group of people in America; that would be the result.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. And would also have the responsibility of repealing the so-called congressional pension bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to take that responsibility, and I am not the only Member of the Senate who has asked for the repeal of the congressional pensions provision. The distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the Democratic leader, day after day during the last week has urged the Senate to repeal it. If the Senator desires to place responsibility for its repeal on my back I am perfectly willing that it rest there; because I am opposed to congressional pensions. I am opposed to them now, and I make no apologies to the Senator from Idaho for trying to repeal the congressional pension bill.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. If the Senator will yield further—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I have not asked the Senator from Virginia for any apologies. I was interrogating the Senator from California as to the effect of this rather sudden and brilliant change in the situation.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Idaho should not infer that the Senate will adopt the Townsend plan merely because the Senate will not agree to the congressional pension plan.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. If the Senator from California will yield further, let me say that I quite resent the statement of the Senator from Virginia that I was trying to infer anything. I was merely inquiring of the Senator from California the parliamentary situation.

Furthermore, I rather resent in a mild way having the Senator from Virginia put words in my mouth. If he desires to draw inferences from anything I may say or any questions I choose to ask, now that the Senator from California has so graciously yielded for that purpose, of course, that is his privilege.

What I desired to find out is—and the Senator from California has really answered the question—why, when his amendment originally was offered as a substitute, and consequently, I suppose, would have embarrassed a great many Members of the Senate in that form, it now comes up in such a way that the Senate may save its face; and I shall be very curious to learn how, on the final vote, assuming the amendment of the Senator from California will be agreed to, the Senator from Virginia will vote.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia has stated that he will vote against all of it.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Including his own amendment?

Mr. BYRD. If the Senate of the United States is only willing to repeal its own pension plan by adopting the Townsend plan, the Senator from Virginia will vote against all of it.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The Senator from Virginia always follows his deep-seated convictions, which everyone here recognizes as entirely honest and based on the utmost integrity.

Mr. GLASS. And, Mr. President, let me say that the other Senator from Virginia will do likewise—will vote against the whole infernal thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield. I am yielding the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall have just a word to say about the matter. If there is any class of people in the world who have my sympathy it is the old and the decrepit. Such sympathy would be natural on my part because I myself am getting along in years. At the proper time I want to help them and will help them. I have done so in the past and will do so again.

In the committee the other day I voted against the legislative pension bill in the form in which it was offered, and I voted against it in the Senate. One of the reasons which impelled me to take that course was the peculiar condition in which the people of America, as a nation, find themselves today. We are confronted in active warfare by two of the greatest military nations that ever have been established on the face of the earth. We have got a great task before us. We must not underestimate it. I do not think we should vote money for pensions of this kind at a time such as this, even though it might be perfectly proper to do so at some time when we were not at war, when we did not need every dollar we can possibly raise. I might favor such a plan if it were for employees serving the Government, and, if that were the case, it might well deal with the members of the legislative branch. I have not gone into that matter. My reason for voting against pensions was because this is not the time to bring up such a matter. We will need every dollar for war purposes. We will need every dollar to save our Government.

As to the amendment offered by my good friend, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], whom I esteem very highly, I feel that this is not the time for it. What good would a pension of this amount or any other amount do needy persons if Japan should get control of this Nation? The needy would get nothing from Japan or Germany if they were to win. What good would a pension do such persons—except temporarily—if Germany should get control of this Nation? Or if Japan got control? We have a task before us, let me say to the Members of the Senate. That task is to defeat our enemies, to preserve our Government, to preserve our way of life;

and we ought not go into other extraneous matters at this time, however worthy. Our main effort, in my judgment almost our entire effort, should be concentrated at this time on winning the war. If we are to spend a billion dollars, as we would have to do if the amendment should be adopted—I have not examined into the matter of how great an expenditure the amendment would require, but I understand the lowest estimate is a billion dollars—where shall we get the money?

I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee. We are confronted in our committee this very day with an application from the War Department for \$32,000,000,000. We will have to appropriate that amount. What for? In order to save the life of our Nation; in order to save, I hope, the deserving people, the unfortunate people whom the Senator from California would help today. I wish to heaven the situation were such that I could aid him in his effort, because those whom he seeks to help are deserving; they have been unfortunate, and the Government should help them whenever it can, but not at this time. We have not the money in the Treasury; we have to raise it by taxation or borrow it. Let us do one thing at a time. Let us save our Government first of all; let us save our people at this time, and not dissipate our resources by spending money for outside things or inside things at this time. Let us save, in every way we can, until the main issue is decided; and that is the war in which, unfortunately, we are engaged.

Mr. President, I have every sympathy and every consideration for and every desire to help the poor old people to whom this amendment would extend help. I wish it were so that I could vote for it. Naturally, my sympathies go out to the elderly people who cannot earn their own living and who have been unfortunate. I wish to heaven I could cooperate with my good friend; but, with my country's very existence at stake, I cannot support the amendment, and I hope the Senate will do what the distinguished Senator from Virginia and I did the other day when we voted against legislative pensions. We voted against them then, and I think the Senate ought to vote against this proposal for old-age pensions for exactly the same reason. Our country comes first; we should protect the whole Nation first, and, then, after that obligation has been satisfied, I will be glad to join my friend from California in doing anything I can for that fine class of our people who have been unfortunate and upon whom the weight of years has fallen. I may disagree with him as to the process, but I am with him as to his purpose.

So, Mr. President, with some misgivings, and the deepest regret I know how to express that I cannot join in the movement initiated by the Senator from California, let me say that I shall try to do my duty toward all the people, and toward my Government by voting "nay" when the amendment comes to a vote.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am compelled to make a statement about the particular pending amendment and also

about the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] from the Civil Service Committee.

As all my colleagues know, I voted for the Retirement Act which contained, among its many provisions, retirement benefits for Members of the legislative branch, that is, for elective officers. I have never quarreled with anybody who took a different view of that question. I have thought that the question had not been fairly treated, I still think so, and I think so without any apology to anyone.

The Retirement Act upon which we voted in the Senate some days ago—a little over a month ago, as I recall—came to us from the House of Representatives, where it had received unanimous approval, at least, there was no single objection, for it passed by unanimous consent, and was taken from a calendar, which would have enabled any one Member of the House to have defeated it by a feeble objection. The bill was a comprehensive one. It dealt with the entire retirement system. Among other things, it raised the contribution to be made by all receiving retirement benefits from $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent to 5 percent.

When the measure reached the committee, and when it came to the floor of the Senate, I considered it in its broad light. I recognize now that when a retirement system is established or when there are brought under it groups, certain inequalities arise and certain objections may be made by those who are already in a service brought under the act. Conditions cannot be equalized altogether, and the Federal Government has never undertaken to equalize the inequalities existing either on the passage of the original retirement act or any subsequent amendment thereto.

In a large sense, I considered that the Retirement Act so far as elective officers were concerned meant simply—and, fairly analyzed and fairly considered, that is what it does mean—that out of everyone's salary who elected to come under it he would pay 5 percent and receive the benefit of the act.

I know that when new groups are brought under a retirement system there are inequalities applicable to those actually then in the service, but I looked upon that act as meaning one thing, namely, that I would pay, if I elected to come under the act, \$500 a year out of my salary. That is a fair statement of it.

I know that much has been said about the possibility of one paying on the basis of a fraction of a day. Such a thought never occurred to me, and, as for myself, I do not believe there is a single Member of the Senate who would pay on the basis of 1 day or 3 days or 5 days and receive \$1 of benefit under the act. I am about to go further than that. I do not believe there is any Member of the Senate who believes that any other Member of the Senate would do that. Certainly that was not contemplated.

Why can we not deal with it fairly? How can we expect the country to deal with any question in a fair way when we ourselves do not deal with it fairly?

What does retirement mean for elective officers? Whether it should be made applicable to elective officers is one ques-

tion; but what does it mean? It means that henceforth, out of his salary, every elective officer who wanted to take advantage of it would pay 5 percent of his salary annually. It never occurred to me that a Senator was on a per diem basis. It never occurred to me that it would occur to anyone else that we were being paid so much a day here, and we could wait until the last hour and pay 5 percent of the last day's salary or 4 days' salary, even if the act, technically construed, would permit that to be done, and claim any benefits under the act.

I have not applied for retirement; I do not intend to apply for retirement. I am not able to apply for retirement, because when I came into the Senate I had all the insurance I was able to carry, and I am not able to pay \$500 a year more for insurance, so far as I am concerned. But I looked at the matter fairly. To me it meant that a man who is coming into the Congress next year or 10 years hence, if he wished to take advantage of the retirement system could pay \$500 a year, or 5 percent of his annual salary, so long as he was here and, provided he had been here 5 years, he could receive whatever benefit the act gave him.

But that is beside the question. I do not think the question has been fairly presented to the American people. The retirement system, aside from however it may work with respect to a few men who are now in service and have been long in service, means only that by paying 5 percent of one's annual salary he may have retirement benefits. I do not see anything immoral in it. There may be sound reasons of policy why it should not be adopted, and on that question I have never quarreled. Someone might take a technical advantage of it, but I do not believe it; and I do not sanction an argument based upon the sole theory that someone would take a technical advantage of an act that was intended to give men in elective office the same right as those in appointive office, the right to claim retirement benefits.

So much for that. I did not originate the legislation. It came over from the House under the circumstances that I have stated, and I simply voted upon it. Then thereafter all these questions were raised, and a great deal on the subject was printed in the newspapers of the country, and the people by and large became interested in the question. I have given to it the most careful consideration that I could give to it under the circumstances; and I have been perfectly willing to admit, since it does affect the elective officers in this body and in the other body, that the people of the country have the right to express themselves, and to express themselves openly and clearly and definitely. I have conceded that their views in a matter that affected elective officers of this body ought to have very great weight, because we live in a democracy; and I have considered also that the thought of the people on this question has grown out of the circumstances under which the act came about, and the peculiar conditions under which we live at this time.

The American people sense that we are in the greatest crisis in our history.

They know very well that this cannot be a short war; that victory can come to us only through a long, bloody war; and therefore they felt that we ought not to have brought up this question; that we ought not to have considered it. We cannot say that the people are wrong on that question. I should be the last man to say that the people were wrong, even though they have not had all the facts given to them; even though there have been very narrow arguments upon very technical grounds illustrating the inequality or inequity or evil effects of the act as applied to particular cases.

So I reach the conclusion, Mr. President, that I should respect the views of the people of my State and the views of the people of the United States; and I mean genuinely respect them, because they understand, far better than we here are perhaps accustomed to think, precisely the bloody sacrifices which they face. They know beyond the peradventure of a doubt, as I have already said, that victory can come only through a long, devastating, bloody war; that victory can come only when that war has reached down into the humblest home, into every city, into every village, into every hamlet, into the crossroads. Every home in this land will feel it and will feel it otherwise than in mere money.

I regretted very much that this agitation could not be at once met by reconsideration of the act that we passed here, only one relatively unimportant provision of which has been discussed in the public press. More than a million Americans are affected by this Retirement Act, perhaps a million and a quarter. In the other body, 435 Members, and here 96, are affected by one provision. We have seen all the turmoil and tumult raised, flung far and wide through the press of the country; and yet the facts exist. Whatever may be the exact facts of this question, looked at fairly and in its broad sense and as applicable to the years to come and not to the mere present hour and to individual cases, our people do not support us in this view.

I think in a democracy the people always have a right to speak; but certainly I myself should never think of questioning their right to speak and their right to express themselves upon any question when on that particular question, I, as a Member of the legislative branch, was directly and personally involved. So I feel that the Civil Service Committee has acted wisely in reporting to the Senate this repeal amendment.

Now, my very good friend from California [Mr. DOWNEY] offers his amendment. Certainly everyone sympathizes with it. There is a great deal of merit in it. Under existing law, the Federal Government is pledged to pay to all needy aged persons above 65 years of age as much as \$20 per month if the State pays a like amount; so the Senator's proposition is nothing more nor less than that the Federal Government will pay \$30 per month not only to those same beneficiaries but to others in the same class who have reached the age of 60 but who are not now under the old-age-benefit provisions of our Social Security law. So there can be, I think, no broad statement

that there is not a great deal of merit in the proposal made by the Senator from California.

I know—and I take no pride in repeating the statement—that in my own State not more than one-half of the people 65 years of age who are eligible for old-age benefits have been placed on the roll. They have been certified, but they are receiving no benefits. I should like to see that condition corrected. The Senator from California assures us that that is not true in many of the States; that it is perhaps true only in five or six States. I should like to see that condition remedied. If the Federal Government were paying \$20 per month to all people of a certain age throughout this country, the addition of \$10 per month without regard to whether the State matched or did not match the payments would not present such a serious question.

There is, however, a serious question involved. One of the reasons why the people of this country did not appreciate the passage by the Congress of the Retirement Act as it applied to elective officers was that we were in this crisis. The American people sense the existence of many things which should not exist. They sense the existence of many things which should be corrected. They sense the existence of things far more important than a retirement system for the elective officers of this Government, which probably would not cost over \$80,000 or \$100,000 a year for several years. They sense things far more important to our welfare and they would like to correct them. A few things float to the top—a dancer appears on the stage and a moving-picture actor is brought here from California to do something, God only knows what. Then the Congress passes a Retirement Act which includes a provision for elective officers. The people seize upon that. They dramatize it. It is not a healthy condition, and they take those things as indicating the fact that everything is not well in this country.

The Senator from California brings in his proposal, with all the merit that is in it, not with any suggestion that we impose any tax. But we will have to impose a tax, and we cannot blink at it; we cannot close our eyes to that fact. We do not know exactly how much additional tax money will have to be raised. It is perfectly certain that if there are a million people between the ages of 60 and 64 who will receive \$30 a month, or \$360 a year, and there are now 2,000,000 people on the old-age-benefit rolls, with many States not able to place upon the rolls all those who have been certified, it is perfectly clear, I think, that there will be in the neighborhood of three and a half to four million people who will receive the \$30 a month. I dare say there will be more than that number for the reason that there are between fourteen and fifteen million people in the United States who have passed the age of 60, and sooner or later the proposed act would bring on the rolls at least 10,000,000 of those fourteen or fifteen million people.

It is an easy calculation to determine that the total cost to the Government would be far in excess of what I believe my very good friend from California sin-

cerely and honestly believes it would be. He estimates that when we consider the saving which will be made, for the same people who will receive the benefits under his amendment, there would be an increase of only five or six or seven hundred million dollars. Perhaps that is true; perhaps he is not underestimating for the moment; but certainly within a very few months that sum would greatly increase, and we would be forced to provide for at least anywhere between a billion and three and a half billion dollars to take care of the people who would be brought on the rolls ultimately under the proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have just today, since the debate started, consulted the Social Security authorities as to the cost of the amendment, and, depending upon the interpretation given to the amendment by the officials of each State who will have the say as to the need of applicants, and in determining who shall receive \$30 a month, in addition to what they now receive, I am advised that the minimum, depending upon all these conditions, would be anywhere from \$1,800,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 per annum.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I did not follow the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. Were his figures applied to my proposal?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I talked with the Social Security authorities, and taking into consideration the provisions of the Senator's amendment, and their assertion that there are approximately 15,000,000 people in the United States above the age of 60, and that anywhere from 33 1/3 percent to 75 percent of the 15,000,000, depending upon the method by which the State authorities administer the test of need, and determine those entitled to the benefit, would receive the pension, the cost of the Senator's amendment to the Treasury of the United States would be from \$1,800,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 per annum, depending upon how the amendment would be administered in the States. That information has been received by me within the hour.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like to comment upon that statement, an ex parte statement; but I shall reserve my remarks. I have taken testimony from the Social Security Board for months; I have their answers to questionnaires, and the figure given is so far astray that I am unhappy that in a tragic, cruel hour such as the present, misinformation such as this is given upon the floor of the Senate. I shall later discuss it more at length.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to conclude what I was about to say.

Mr. LUCAS. This is a very interesting question, in view of the last statement made by the Senator from California. I have before me the report of the hearings, wherein the Senator from

California testified upon this very question. I may be in error in this, and if I am the Senator from California can correct me, but I am assuming that his amendment now pending is the same about which he testified, as the testimony is found in the hearings on Senate bill 1932.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator it is not. As I recall, that amendment called for an appropriation of about \$4,000,000,000. Is that the one to which the Senator refers?

Mr. LUCAS. This is the Senator's statement—

Mr. DOWNEY. I assure the Senator very definitely—and I shall be glad to have him discuss it, and I shall take it up later—that that was a different proposal. As I recall, that was the proposal for social dividends.

Mr. LUCAS. This is on the basis of \$30 a month.

Mr. DOWNEY. On the basis of social dividends, not on the basis of need.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not take any more of the time of the Senator from Georgia, but this is an interesting statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will not the Senator tell me the page of the hearing to which he has referred?

Mr. LUCAS. Page 8.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was not trying to make a dogmatic statement about the cost of this amendment, and I accord to the Senator from California the utmost sincerity, and I recognize that he has long studied this question, but on the basis of a million people between the ages of 60 and 64 who would be brought in, and on the basis of 2,000,000 or 2,250,000 who are already on the old-age benefit rolls, recognizing that in many States only half those who have been certified have gone on the rolls, I am quite sure that at least 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 people would immediately go on the rolls. When we have accounted for all the savings which would be made, the cost to the Government would certainly exceed a billion dollars, and the ultimate cost, less the saving which would be made by relieving the same beneficiaries who are now receiving some consideration—and I grant inadequate consideration—would ultimately run between \$1,000,000,000 and \$3,400,000,000 a year.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the amendment of the Senator from California would the State authorities be allowed to determine the question of need, and still pay the flat \$30?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would there not be a great temptation to State officers who may be politically minded to put on the rolls practically everyone so he would get \$30 a month?

Mr. GEORGE. I think undoubtedly there would be a great temptation to do so, because the State officials would still determine the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. The State would not be required to match the Federal payment.

Mr. GEORGE. The State would not be required to match the Federal payment. It would all come from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is true that at present the State determines the question of need.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There would be no change in that respect.

Mr. GEORGE. There would be no change in that respect, but the State is required to match up to 50 percent the total amount paid by the Federal Government to each beneficiary.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the question I was about to ask the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that brings me to this point: Under the present tax laws as they now exist, and before any amendments have been made to them, the tax burden of the American people will be \$17,000,000,000 in a full year of operation, for the fiscal year 1943. The Social Security taxes will mean an additional \$1,000,000,000. Therefore, the total tax burden will be \$18,000,000,000 under the present law. The President in his Budget message called for from \$7,000,000,000 to \$9,000,000,000 additional taxes. Since the President's Budget message the House and the Senate have appropriated or now have under consideration for immediate passage appropriations in excess of the President's recommendations. So we face facts and realities. Therefore, why is it not better to consider this proposal at a time when we can consider also the means of raising the money to pay it? Why is it not better for the committees of Congress this year—because the President has already called not merely for additional taxes, but for a reconsideration of the whole Social Security Act, and has called for vastly increased taxes under that act—why is it not better to consider this problem when we can at the same time consider how to meet the additional burden that will be thrown on the American people?

I now come to this point, and with it I shall conclude. As I interpret the reaction of the American people to the retirement system carried in the act passed a few days ago with respect to elective officers, they do not want the American Congress to be talking about, discussing, or passing on questions of pensions now. They are not against all relief of the character which the distinguished Senator from California has so earnestly and consistently advocated since he became a Member of this body; but they do not want the American Congress to stand here day after day and talk about, and argue about, and debate questions of pensions and benefits either to elective officers or to many worthy people of the United States who are not now receiving adequate support, or old-age benefits, or old-age assistance. That, at least, is the way I interpret the feelings of the American people. The American people expect their Congress to deal with first things first, and for the time being to forget things such as this which make so

strong an appeal to our hearts and our sympathies, and to face the issue which is paramount before the Nation.

Mr. President, if we keep on bringing up the past to fight with the stubborn and irrepressible problems of today, there will be no future for America. If we keep on bringing up all the good things which we desire to do, and placing the additional burden of the great benefits which we are anxious to grant, on the backs of our people, there may not be any future for America. This war will not win itself. We are within 60 or 90 days of the most momentous drive by the Axis Powers that this war has yet seen. What the consequences of that drive may be, no man here can say.

Mr. President, I thought it was all right to give to elective officers the same benefits which we gave to appointive officers under a contributive retirement system. Others of my colleagues for whom I have the greatest respect thought differently. We all ought to know, I think, that the American people feel this is no time for the Congress to be quarreling about and debating an issue such as this. While nine-tenths of the Members of the Senate, perhaps more than nine-tenths, would be willing to go further than we have gone to aid the worthy old people in the country, this is certainly no time to get into a dispute over these things.

Some of our people may have suffered in the past and some may suffer in the future, but there is no suffering comparable to the state of all of us if we do not make up our minds to go through with the big, pressing, imperative duties which rest upon us as the representatives of the American people in this hour.

Mr. President, I do not think we need to be afraid to vote against the pending proposal under the circumstances, and, so far as I am concerned, I will be compelled to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from California. There will be an opportunity even this year to consider the grant of additional benefits and likewise to consider the means of meeting the obligations of the Government. I know very well that a war can be financed while it is in progress, but I know very well that we may finance a war in such a way as will destroy the Nation when we shall have finished financing the war. I know there are burdens which our people cannot bear. Look over this country. The farmers in every State are losing their labor. They are not able to keep laborers on the farms. Wages have been advanced everywhere. Groups have demanded higher wages. Groups are still demanding higher wages. The farmers are worried about this picture. The merchant, the professional man, every man, every woman, is worried. Before the war ends, crepe will be on the doors of a million homes in America, and our people know it. My answer is this: Before I think about any particular piece of legislation those people have the right to be heard; and they have a right to have me reflect their views and their settled convictions. I will follow their direction to me in this hour when I know it.

My people do not want to deny the older people the benefits which they

ought to have and which they need; but they cannot do everything at once. They can only do the day's work in the day. If we have not the courage to face these great tugging appeals to our hearts and sympathies how can we expect our people to have the courage to make the sacrifices they must make?

I do not speak so much of sacrifices of money. I mean the sacrifice of everything. So long as the settled conviction rests in the hearts and minds of American citizens, men and women, fathers and mothers, that such sacrifices must now be made, however they came to us, and without regard to who is to blame, if anyone is to blame, they cannot feel and cannot give to us the cooperation we must have in order to win in this great struggle unless we do our part.

The war will be won not on this floor. It will be won by every father and mother, every sister and brother who gives up blood; and the American people know it. Somehow I have the feeling that they are saying to us, "Do not waste your time on pensions or retirement benefits for yourselves, or on additional benefits to the old who must stay here. Stop arguing about things like that. Shut off the debate, and face the big question we must answer."

That is the way I feel about it. I feel that way with the utmost kindness toward the Senator from California and his proposal. I feel that way toward all my brethren who have taken different views on any question which is involved in this debate.

So far as I am concerned, I want to act under the settled conviction that none of these things, however worthy or appealing, should through any act of mine be permitted to disturb, distract and divide, or even for a moment to dampen the ardor, conviction, and loyalty of our people. Let us remember that if we are to fight over such questions as the one now before us, there will not be any tomorrow to fight for anything in America. Even after the war, when we are asked, "What are your great peace programs?" let us say, "For the sake of America do not bring your schemes now to the fore, however inviting, intelligent, and wise you may think they may be. You will only divide the counsel of the American people. You will only raise issues and questions for debate."

I hope this body will recognize the burden which rests upon those of us who must now put heavier burdens on our own people for the actual demands of the war—burdens which I believe the American people will be very hard pressed to meet on March 15 of this year and March 15 of 1943.

Mr. DOWNEY. First, Mr. President, I desire to offer my apology to our distinguished leader, for whom I have a very deep affection, for my impatient demeanor and words to him. I regret that I spoke so hastily and extremely. I dislike to add to his burdens in any way by my own demeanor. However, that is unimportant. I may have been inconsiderate. A rather serious question of fact has arisen on the floor of the Senate. I realize that it is unfortunate that I am compelled to present this pension

measure in this way; but for 3 long years, as the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee must corroborate me, I have endeavored to secure an exhaustive and careful investigation of pensions by the Finance Committee, and any action of any kind upon any pension bill that could be brought out after some sort of hearing and report. For 3 long years this issue, which the latest Democratic national platform declared itself ready to meet, and which 90 percent of the American people want to meet, has not had the attention of a committee in such a way as to result in hearings, or in a report from the committee.

Failing in that, Mr. President, with the cooperation of former Senator Byrnes, who has now gone to the Supreme Court, I succeeded in having a special committee appointed to investigate old-age pensions. That committee and its members worked exhaustively for months, and I secured voluminous data from Mr. Falk, of the Social Security Board. I hold in my hand letters and documents from Mr. Falk corroborating the figures which I have given to the Senate.

Our distinguished leader tells me that over the telephone Mr. Falk has given him totally different figures. The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. GEORGE] states totally different figures from mine. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] began to read aloud from the report of our special committee, in which it is said that the plan which that committee recommended would cost about \$3,670,000,000 a year. That plan was totally different from the one now proposed. That plan called for social dividends for all persons not gainfully employed; and our figures indicated that 10,000,000 persons would be eligible for that kind of a pension, while only 3,000,000 people would be eligible on the basis of need.

So when the Senator from Illinois, very honestly, sincerely, and reasonably, picked up my report and stated that the figures therein are in opposition to what I have said on the floor, he was reasonable, but he was not accurate, because the figures given in the report apply to a plan of social dividends and not one based on the need test. The figures in writing from Mr. Falk, under date of November 21, 1941, show that on the basis of need approximately 3,000,000 persons would be entitled to the proposed aid, which, at \$30 a month, would make approximately \$1,000,000,000 and not \$1,800,000,000, or three or four billion dollars.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself differ radically upon another question. I think our people at every crossroads, every village, hamlet, and city, are just as much distressed to see the misery and insecurity of large numbers of our old people as they are to read about tragic happenings in Manila and other portions of the world. I do not believe the American people will resent our seeking some reasonable way to alleviate suffering, starvation, and misery. The people of California will not do so, at least; and in Georgia there are as many people in

unhappy circumstances as there are in California.

I think the distinguished Senator is in error in another respect. The bill does not call for giving guns or powder or bombs or planes to the elderly people. It is designed to give them \$30 a month, with which to buy bread. I do not know how the giving of bread and milk and a few warm clothes to our elderly people would hasten the loss of the Philippines or prolong the war in Europe.

Mr. President, today, under the Social Security Act, the workers and employees of this Nation are paying over a billion dollars into the pension fund, which is now, it is true, being diverted to war purposes. If others of us have to be taxed so that we have a little less to eat in order to give others enough to live on, I am in favor of doing so; and I say that the American people want to do it. The American people do not want to exist in a land of superabundant food, and not provide food, shelter, and clothing for their elderly brethren. I am not proposing to give radios, automobiles, rubber, magnesium, bombs, or bayonets to the elderly people. The measure is designed to give them bread, butter, a little meat, and a little warm clothing; and it would not require the sum stated—I believe erroneously—by the distinguished speakers. I stand on my facts.

Mr. President, I have no desire to engage in an ex parte discussion in an attempt to convince the Senate that I am correct in my figures, as against those submitted by honorable and noted Senators who differ with me. The matter is of tremendous importance to millions of people. Therefore, I ask my distinguished leader to have Mr. Falk come into consultation tomorrow morning with him, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, and myself so that we may find out what are the accurate figures. Mr. Falk has them. He and his experts worked for months in assembling them at the request of our committee. They are all available. As a matter of fact, I have them here, under Mr. Falk's signature. I think the majority leader, for the sake of the dignity and accuracy of the proceedings on this floor, should consent to my request, so that tomorrow we can state to the Senate what, in the opinion of the Social Security experts and of Senators who talked with the representatives of the Social Security Board, this plan would cost. If the majority leader can accede to my request and agree to delay a vote upon the amendment until after we have the facts, I shall conclude my remarks for the present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, much as the Senator from Kentucky should regret the delay, I wish to state that in my own time I intend to make a few remarks on the Senator's amendment, and I shall be glad to discuss the question propounded by the Senator from California during that period of the debate.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then I shall conclude, because I shall have another opportunity to speak if the Senator from Kentucky does not accede to my request.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want my statement that I intend to make a few

remarks to encourage the Senator to make a few more. [Laughter.] I feel that under the circumstances I should have something to say about the Senator's amendment from my standpoint. I am anxious to obtain all the information I can obtain on the subject. I do not want to deceive the Senate, and I am sure the Senator does not desire to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am sure neither of us does.

Mr. BARKLEY. Neither does the Senator from Georgia. No Senator desires to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then let us get the information tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should not for a moment agree to postpone the vote on the Senator's amendment merely that we might call in Mr. Falk in order to obtain some additional information from him. I will say to the Senator that I made an effort to find out something about what has been sprung on us here today. The Senator's amendment has not even been printed; I have probably the only carbon copy of it, and I have tried to study it. No other Senator has been able to read it. In fairness to the Senate, I tried to ascertain what the amendment would mean in the way of men, women, and money. I called the Social Security Board, and asked first for Mr. Altmeyer, who has been in charge of the Board since it has been established. He was absent from his office, so I talked to Mr. Falk. I told him what the Senator's amendment provided, as best I could understand it, and I asked him to give me the facts with reference to the number of persons and the amount of expense involved. After an hour of research—and he is the head of the Research Division of the Social Security Board—I obtained the facts which I stated in the time of the Senator from Georgia.

Whether the Senator from California, the Senator from Georgia, and I should go into a huddle with Mr. Falk in order to try to get any clearer statement of the probabilities is a problem in itself. Mr. Falk stated that, depending upon the interpretation of the law and the administration of it in each State under State authorities in determining who would be needy persons under the terms of the Senator's amendment, the minimum cost would be anywhere from \$1,800,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000. That shows that even the Social Security Board cannot with any degree of accuracy estimate even the minimum cost to the Treasury of the Senator's amendment; and I do not know whether any conversation in the presence of all of us would shed any more light on the subject. I must say that, regardless of the uncertainties, the various approaches to the problem, and the various interpretations which might be placed upon the terms of the measure by State authorities, I believe the Senator is bound to admit that the minimum cost of his amendment, in terms of money to be taken out of the Treasury, would very likely be in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000,000 a year, although I believe in his previous remarks he has suggested that it would be \$600,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Oh, no; I have stated that the gross cost of the amendment

would be somewhat in excess of \$1,000,000,000 — perhaps \$1,100,000,000 or \$1,200,000,000. But we should deduct from that figure almost \$350,000,000, which during the next fiscal year will be paid under the present Old-Age Assistance Act, the amount which will be paid on W. P. A. for persons between 60 and 65 years of age, and the amount being paid on general relief. I state a fact, after months of investigation, when I say that the net sum would be \$500,000,000, \$600,000,000, or \$700,000,000; and I base those figures upon the work done by Mr. Falk and his experts.

Let us analyze for a moment the absurdity of the information given to the Senator by Mr. Falk. If the \$4,000,000,000 of which the Senator speaks is a correct estimate, 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 persons would get \$30 a month. Mr. President, a majority of the persons past 60 who are employed would not give up their jobs. Three or four million persons are getting pensions and have savings. Even a suggestion to anyone who knows the facts that the expenditures under the bill might reach \$3,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000 is so totally unjust and unfair that I, for one, will not consent to have it pass unnoticed. I serve notice upon the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that tomorrow morning I shall make every effort I can make to get the facts from and have the figures verified by Mr. Falk. I shall try to present the facts to the Senate tomorrow afternoon. Perhaps I shall not be able to do so. As I understand the matter, I will have the right, so long as I can stand here and talk, to speak in an effort to accomplish that purpose, and I certainly shall do so. I want the facts presented to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Is it not a fact that every Senator on the floor understands and knows how he is going to vote on the Byrd amendment? So why would it not be a good plan to vote on that amendment, and then, as to the amendment offered by the Senator from California today, which is a matter of controversy, which nobody has seen, the Senator could go into a "huddle" with whomever he wants to "huddle" with tomorrow or the next day. In that way a vote could come on the proposal—and I might vote for it—but it seems to me that, under what we call the democratic process, we ought somewhere, at some time, somehow, get a vote on the Byrd amendment, which is what the people want.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the parliamentary situation as it now exists there cannot be a vote on the Byrd amendment until there is a vote on the Downey amendment, because the Downey amendment is offered as an amendment to the Byrd amendment and must be voted on first.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I understand the parliamentary situation exactly, and I was merely appealing to the eminent fairness of the Senator from California to permit us to vote on the Byrd amendment, and then bring his amendment up when there is no other question involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only way that could be done would be for the Senator from California to withdraw his amendment, have a vote on the Byrd amendment, and then offer his amendment independently as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. That is the reason for my taking the floor and appealing to the Senator from California. I understand the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire recognition in my own right at the present time if no other Senator desires the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have before me the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, containing some figures about which there can be no possible debate. A table appears in the report at page 591 which I think ought to appear in the RECORD as a part of this debate, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be so printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

TABLE 39.—Amount of interest-bearing debt outstanding, the computed annual interest charge, and the computed rate of interest, for the fiscal years 1916–41, and by months from July 1940 to June 1941¹

[On basis of daily Treasury statements (revised), see p. 405]

Year and month	Interest bearing debt ²	Computed annual interest charge	Computed rate of interest
Year ended June 30—			Percent
1916.....	\$971,562,590	\$23,084,635	2.376
1917.....	2,712,549,476	83,625,482	3.120
1918.....	11,985,882,436	468,618,544	3.910
1919.....	25,234,496,273	1,054,204,509	4.178
1920.....	24,061,095,361	1,016,592,219	4.225
1921.....	23,737,352,080	1,020,917,503	4.339
1922.....	22,711,035,587	962,896,535	4.240
1923.....	22,007,590,754	927,331,341	4.214
1924.....	20,981,586,429	876,960,673	4.180
1925.....	20,210,906,251	829,680,044	4.105
1926.....	19,383,770,860	793,423,952	4.093
1927.....	18,250,943,965	722,675,553	3.960
1928.....	17,317,695,096	671,352,112	3.877
1929.....	16,638,941,379	656,654,311	3.946
1930.....	15,921,892,350	606,031,831	3.807
1931.....	16,519,588,640	588,987,438	3.566
1932.....	19,161,273,540	671,604,676	3.505
1933.....	22,157,643,120	742,175,955	3.350
1934.....	26,480,487,920	842,301,133	3.181
1935.....	\$27,645,229,826	750,677,802	2.716
1936.....	32,755,631,770	838,002,053	2.559
1937.....	35,802,586,915	924,347,089	2.582
1938.....	36,578,684,982	947,164,071	2.589
1939.....	39,891,844,494	1,037,107,765	2.600
1940.....	42,380,009,306	1,094,721,802	2.593
1941.....	48,404,879,488	1,218,693,931	2.518
Month ended—			
1940—			
July.....	43,190,425,524	1,114,987,258	2.582
August.....	43,320,109,105	1,118,210,887	2.581
September.....	43,482,408,445	1,122,060,918	2.580
October.....	43,563,458,401	1,127,589,059	2.588
November.....	43,711,378,410	1,131,288,656	2.588
December.....	44,471,127,691	1,141,157,162	2.566
1941—			
January.....	45,333,806,281	1,152,185,919	2.542
February.....	45,562,531,763	1,158,400,847	2.542
March.....	46,583,389,171	1,178,161,821	2.529
April.....	46,679,193,749	1,181,347,458	2.531
May.....	47,176,441,205	1,194,463,905	2.532
June.....	48,404,879,488	1,218,693,931	2.518

¹ For monthly data back to June 30, 1916, see annual reports for 1929, p. 509; for 1936, p. 442; and corresponding tables in subsequent reports.

² The interest-bearing debt includes discount on Treasury bills from June 30, 1930, the amount being deducted from the interest-bearing debt prior to calculating the average interest rate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the majority

leader and the attention of the Senate to this striking fact: In 1920, after World War No. 1, the national debt of the United States was somewhat more than \$24,000,000,000; the annual interest charge upon that debt in 1920 was \$1,016,592,219, and the interest rate was 4.225. In other words, the interest in a single year upon a \$24,000,000,000 debt was more than \$1,000,000,000.

In the years which followed the national debt was somewhat reduced, but not materially. The lowest point reached was in 1930, 10 years afterward, when it amounted to \$15,921,892,350. The annual interest charge that year was \$606,031,831, and the interest rate had been reduced to 3.8. The interest rate was being cut down gradually, but in 1941, Mr. President, the interest-bearing debt, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, was \$48,404,879,488. In other words, it was more than twice as great as was the debt at the peak after the World War.

The Secretary of the Treasury has been unusually effective in reducing the interest rate upon the national debt. Of course, interest rates upon all investments have been falling off, but in 1941, with an interest rate of 2.518, the annual interest charge was \$1,218,693,931.

When the President of the United States sent the Budget to the Congress in January this year he estimated that the interest upon the national debt for the fiscal year 1942 would be \$1,750,000,000. That, Mr. President, is more than \$13 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Last year the annual debt was about \$60,000,000,000, far more than twice as large as it was in 1920.

As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], chairman of the subcommittee on deficiencies of the Appropriations Committee, said a little earlier this afternoon, the Appropriations Committee is now considering the War Department appropriation bill for \$32,000,000,000. In a single appropriation bill we are about to make an appropriation greater than the whole war debt of 1920.

The President in his summons to Congress after the bombs fell at Pearl Harbor said to us that we ought to spend at least \$56,000,000,000 on arms and ammunition and implements of war. That means an expenditure almost equal to, indeed, greater than, the entire national debt in 1941. We are headed straight for a national debt of well over a hundred billion dollars.

Mr. President, no one can look at those figures, about which there can be no dispute, without wondering where, under heaven, the money is coming from with which to pay the enormous bill.

So, Mr. President, I feel, as the eloquent Senator from Georgia said, that the first thing for us to consider is not increasing benefits for ourselves or for any of the people of the United States; what we are interested in, or ought to be interested in, alone, is the preservation of the democratic system, for, unless that system is preserved, there can be no benefits paid to any group of citizens.

If this system shall not be preserved, then, we shall have to look for our benefits to some sort of a totalitarian dictator.

Mr. President, I venture to say that the people of the United States, from coast to coast, have a better understanding of the gravity of this situation, and have a better comprehension of the mortal danger in which the democratic system stands today, than have many of us here in Washington. There has been too much complacency in Washington. There is no complacency, I can say to the Senate, among the people of the country at large. There was complacency in Hawaii among the high command of the Army and of the Navy, or else the disaster at Pearl Harbor would not have taken place. There was complacency in New York in the naval command there or else the disaster, the sabotage of the *Normandie*, would not have taken place. Complacency means that we are not opening our eyes to the grave danger which our country confronts, and that we persist in acting as though we were not engaged in a mortal struggle. The time has gone by to think of the benefits and improvements that we should like to have in our system. The only issue before us now is to preserve the system; and that, Mr. President, we cannot do by increasing the national debt for any object except the defense of our country and the confusion of its enemies.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], in which he has emphasized, it seems to me, the problem that must be on the heart and mind of every Member of the United States Senate.

Before I say what I wish to say—and I hope I shall not be very lengthy in my remarks—about the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], I desire to retract something I said yesterday in contradiction of a remark made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], chairman of the Committee on Civil Service.

Yesterday the Senator suggested that the bill to which the Byrd amendment is an amendment in the nature of a repealer of the so-called congressional pension came to Congress as an administration measure; and in the colloquy that transpired between him and me I stated that insofar as it was a general broadening and liberalizing of the retirement laws affecting all Government employees it might be so regarded, but that I did not think the congressional pension could be termed an administration proposal. I was under the erroneous impression at that time that the congressional pension was added to the bill in the House of Representatives, that it came here with that provision in it, went to the Civil Service Committee, and was reported to the Senate. I find from a reading of the original bill, introduced on the 19th of February 1941—a year ago today—that there was a provision for benefits to elective officers. The bill had been drawn by the Civil Service Commission after consultation, as I am informed, with an interdepartmental committee dealing with the question of more liberal

retirement privileges granted to Government employees.

In that respect I was in error. Insofar as concerns that provision being an administration provision in the sense that it was approved by the administration—by which we usually mean the President and his advisers—I am not in a position to say whether they knew about it; but it does not matter, so far as the fundamental principle is concerned, whether that provision was in the bill originally, or whether it was added in the House, or was added here.

I wanted to explain that I was in error insofar as the statement of the Senator from South Dakota was concerned to the effect that the provision was not in the bill as originally introduced in the House and in the Senate—in the House by the Representative from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and in the Senate by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], chairman of the committee.

I desire to take occasion also to say that I personally—and I am sure the Senate—appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the chairman of the committee, who for many years has been a sincere advocate of civil-service reform, who has sponsored here legislation in behalf of civil-service expansion; and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who, as the agent of the committee, piloted this measure through the Senate when it was before the Senate on the 19th day of January. There are no two Members of the Senate for whom any of us have greater respect and affection than we have for the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New York. Whether they would have initiated a so-called congressional retirement provision, I do not know, if they had been originally drawing the legislation which is the subject of our discussion; but it came here from the other body with this controversial provision in it. The Committee on Civil Service declined to eliminate it, and it came to the Senate body under the sponsorship of that committee and under the piloting of the distinguished and able Senator from New York; and he performed his duty; and the Senator from South Dakota performed his duty as chairman, as agents of the committee in bringing into the Senate and defending the bill as it had been reported by the committee to the Senate.

Mr. President, on the subject of the congressional pension, I do not deem it necessary to say much. It is often said that if our foresight were as good as our hindsight we should all be more fortunate than we are; and that is an unadulterated truth. As I stated the other day in opening up this subject for discussion, I do not believe the retirement bill passed the Senate by a vote of 42 to 24 because the congressional retirement provision was in the bill. It is my honest opinion that if the bill had been limited to the retirement privileges extended to the ordinary Government employees of the United States it would have received a larger vote on its passage than it received with the congressional provision in it.

There might not then have been any serious opposition to the bill, because for many years we have been committed to granting retirement privileges to civil-service employees of the Government of the United States. But it was there; and regardless of whether it was defensible on sound actuarial grounds, it came at a time when the people were in no mood to consider favorably or with patience privileges granted by members of the legislative body to themselves; so the agitation arose here and elsewhere for its repeal.

The amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] presents somewhat an analogous situation, but to my mind a more important situation so far as the people of the United States are concerned than the congressional privilege which is the subject of discussion.

We here in Washington are sometimes prone to take an artificial view of the reactions which are inherent in what we do here. The most important thing that can happen to the American people in these days of crisis is to have their faith in the processes of democracy preserved. No more unfortunate thing could happen than for them to believe, or have any ground for believing, that in this great crisis, when the stability of our institutions is involved, when the integrity of the Western Hemisphere is involved, when our American way of life is involved, their legislative representatives take a frivolous or irresponsible viewpoint with regard to anything which may affect the welfare of our country. I say with regret that I think the injection of this issue into what otherwise would be sound and legitimate retirement legislation has had a tendency to create the impression that we are dealing frivolously and irresponsibly with a great issue which hangs heavy on the hearts and the brains of the American people.

The cost, whether it is \$80,000 or \$150,000, is not material; but the faith of the American people in their representatives and in their system of government is infinitely more important than any calculation, by any mathematical process, in terms of dollars. I am assuming that, so far as the congressional pension provision is concerned, it will be repealed by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. President, that leads me to the discussion of the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and I testify here publicly to the devotion and the sincerity and the enthusiasm of the Senator from California for the issue which he has raised. No one can possibly doubt the sincerity of the Senator. No one can possibly doubt that he regards this as one of the great problems facing the American people. He is so sincere about it and so anxious to get action upon it that, as I have said to him privately several times, I fear he does not always use the proper vehicle or the proper occasion, when the result might be most favorable to the cause in which he is enlisted.

I am in great sympathy with the objectives of the Senator, and, if he will recall, when I delivered an address as

permanent chairman of the Democratic convention in Chicago in 1940 I declared myself in favor of the recognition of the obligation of the American people to the older part of our population, as a national obligation which should be discharged regardless of what any State might do upon the subject. I still entertain those views, and I have in public and in private declared for them, and tried to emphasize them as much as I could.

I have always believed, and I now believe, that from a national standpoint there is no reason why a man or a woman in Kentucky or Mississippi or Georgia or Missouri should not receive an amount equivalent to what is received by people in other States living under the same circumstances. Yet, due to whim or caprice, or the inability of any State to measure up to the high standards set in other States with respect to old-age compensation, or pensions, as we call them, there is a difference.

The matter under discussion has, as the Senator has stated, been before the Congress ever since the Senator came here as a Senator from California, and he has been industrious and diligent, and properly so, in presenting the issue to the Congress and to the committee having jurisdiction. As originally presented, the proposal carried a sort of self-operating tax proposal which would pay for it. I do not believe now, and I have never believed, that from an economic standpoint we could afford to impose a burden of this sort on the Treasury of the United States and on the people without providing a method by which it could be liquidated. I entertained that thought even in time of peace, when our obligations for war were not so persistent.

I cannot claim authority on the subject of statistics; I am not an economist; I do not deal with this matter day by day, as the Social Security Board deals with it, and I took the liberty of calling the Social Security Board to ascertain, as best I could, what the proposal would cost in all probability. No one can be absolutely accurate about it. No one can predict how many dollars it would cost. The answer is only an estimate, at best. But I think it is beyond dispute that there are approximately 15,000,000 people in the United States—or 14,750,000, I am informed, which is almost 15,000,000—who are beyond the age of 60 years, and that the reduction of the age from 65 to 60 will add a million. This million will draw the \$30 a month, which means \$360 a year, which amounts to \$360,000,000 a year for the million. Two million and a quarter on the rolls will also draw the \$30 a month, and it is an easy matter to multiply 2,250,000 people by \$360 to arrive at the additional annual cost.

Mr. DOWNEY. And the Senator arrives at exactly the figure I have been arguing for. He has worked it out.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, assuming there would be no additions to the roll over and above the million between 60 and 65 years of age, and over and above the two and a half million now on the roll; but I think we must assume that

over a period of 25 years, certainly not more than 30 years, the number on the rolls will be doubled, and that the number will be progressively increased year after year during the 25-year period.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me point out to the Senator that in addition to old-age assistance we have a parallel system known as old-age insurance, which now comprehends almost all the American people. It does not include the public workers, who have their own system, or the farmers, or the domestic employees, but it includes 80 to 85 percent of the American people, and within 10 years, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, all those people will be receiving their dividends by virtue of their old-age assurance payments. Instead of the load increasing, it will steadily decrease in the coming years, for two reasons—increasing employment today is decreasing the need, and the increase in the number of people under old-age insurance is taking off part of the load.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is, of course, in part, if not in whole, due to the stimulus given to employment by the war program, and when the war ends, and that program is over, no one can predict the recession which may transpire in the matter of employment. But let us assume that the additional cost is \$1,150,000,000. Are we prepared now, without any provision for raising the amount of money necessary to discharge that obligation, to add that amount to the charge of the Treasury of the United States in the midst of this great crisis under the circumstances under which the measure is brought before the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to ask the Senator how the figure of 3,000,000 people that would be involved in this program was arrived at?

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may answer the Senator, it is arrived at in this way: There are now approximately two and one-quarter million people on the rolls of those who receive what we call old-age pensions. That involves those who are above the age of 65. If under the amendment the age limit is reduced from 65 to 60 years, that takes in another million; and if we add that 1,000,000 to the two and one-quarter million already drawing old-age subsistence, when the amount put up by the Government of the United States is supposed to be matched by the States, we get 3,250,000 persons who would be eligible under this amendment to the \$30 per month.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know how many people in the various States have made application for old-age pensions and have been refused for some technical reason?

Mr. BARKLEY. I had those figures some time ago, but I do not have them up to date, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, however, that the number who have applied for old-age subsistence in the States—and in all cases the State

authorities determine the eligibility of applicants—the number who have applied who have been denied for one reason or another participation in these benefits throughout the country, I think, would amount to almost half as many as are now receiving the benefits.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event the States were to be permitted to determine, would it not be a fair assumption, in view of the fact that the Government is going to pay the bill, that probably one-half of those now denied benefits would immediately go on the rolls under those circumstances?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is fair to assume that when the Government of the United States proposes to add to what is now being paid, \$30 a month out of the Treasury, which is not required to be matched, that the State authorities will very largely increase the number of those who can draw the benefits, and, therefore, we cannot limit the expense to those who are now on the rolls or who would come in under a reduction of the age from 65 to 60.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may, I wish to say a few words at this point in connection with this whole question. I did not support the so-called pension bill in the beginning. I should like to vote for its repeal right now. I think it ought to be repealed in the interest of the country and in the interest of fairness to the Members of the Senate who want to vote on this matter, and in the interest of unity throughout the Nation, which is so essential if we are going to do the nearly impossible in fighting the totalitarian powers. With all due deference to the Senator from California, we should not have to take days in discussing this plan, and I want to say to the distinguished majority leader and to Members of the Senate that, in my humble opinion, we are further disuniting the people as the result of what we have done in connection with this pension debate.

For 3 or 4 days we have been attempting to repeal a provision of law which practically everyone wants repealed in the interest of the country, and yet we are treated to the spectacle here of being compelled possibly to continue for another 2 or 3 days the debate on the so-called pension plan now offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States does not wake up pretty soon to its responsibilities in connection with the greatest problem that has ever faced the American people since the days of the Revolution, I do not know what will happen. Is it any wonder that the people are losing their respect for men in Congress when we stand here day after day and cannot get a vote upon a simple matter in connection with the repeal of a measure that everyone wants to vote on at the present time?

Insofar as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I want the Senate and the country to know that I voted originally against the pension bill. I will vote for its repeal. I will vote against the Downey amendment, and I will vote against all other pension proposals that come before the Congress during this great emergency.

Mr. President, I hope every United States Senator will take to heart what the great Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said in one of the most remarkable speeches I have ever heard upon this floor. It is the bigger things that the Senate and the country have to look to if we are to win the struggle for democracy. All the matters which we are debating here now will be of yesterday in the event we do not defeat and crush the totalitarian powers which are working day and night, night and day, in attempting to crush what Lincoln said was the last and best hope on earth. With all due deference to everyone, I say, Mr. President, that we can "nobly win" as Lincoln said, "or meanly lose," and the very things that we are doing here are contributing to the latter, rather than to the former.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I agree with him in every word he has said. However, this proposition is before us. We must vote on it first before we can vote upon the matter which was the original cause of this controversy. I want the Senate to know some of the things involved in the amendment which is now to be voted on first.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not want the Senator to think that I was criticizing him.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; of course not. It is an unfortunate situation, but one that is entirely parliamentary and one we must deal with as it is.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HOLMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, Mr. President, before I yield. I want to emphasize what the Senator from Illinois has said, by this supplementary remark: I do not care whether it costs \$1,150,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000. The information I received today from the head of the research division of the Social Security Board of the United States, established by the Congress, is that it will cost from \$1,800,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 a year, depending on how the law is administered in the States. But let us accept the figure stated by the Senator from California, which approximately confirms the figures I have given, based on the number of those who are now beneficiaries of the system, assuming that no one else comes in, and let us say it costs \$1,150,000,000, where is that money to come from? It is not now in the Treasury, as every one knows. We have, since we met here on the 5th day of January, appropriated over \$40,000,000,000 for war purposes, and we have not even started on the regular annual appropriation bills.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. BONE rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not yield to any Senator until I conclude with these figures. We passed one bill appropriating twelve and one-half billion dollars, we passed another bill appropriating twenty-six and a half billion dollars, and we did not devote as much time to both of them combined as we have devoted to pensions in the Senate of the United States.

The House on yesterday or day before passed a bill appropriating \$32,000,000,000 for war purposes, and in a day or two that bill will be before the Senate of the United States, and when that bill shall have been passed the total will amount to \$72,000,000,000 appropriated within 6 weeks or 7 weeks to carry on this war, and we still will not have begun on the regular annual appropriations to maintain the normal peacetime operations of the Government.

We are raising \$13,000,000,000 a year under our present tax laws. Awhile ago the Senator from Georgia stated that we could raise approximately \$17,000,000,000 under our present tax laws, which includes, of course, the taxes which are being levied for social-security purposes, which may be available for wartime expenses.

Ever since the 5th day of January the House Committee on Ways and Means has been waiting for the Treasury Department to submit a program by which it could raise \$7,000,000,000 more, making a total of \$20,000,000,000. When we shall have raised \$20,000,000,000 a year in taxes we shall not have raised enough money to pay one-third the cost of our Government during this war.

We are now asked to appropriate a minimum of \$1,150,000,000, without any taxes and without any provision to raise a dime to discharge the obligation which it is proposed to put on the Treasury of the United States. We are asked to do it because we are now trying to repeal a law under which the charge against the Treasury would be \$80,000 or \$100,000. In order to get ourselves out of a little hole, we are asked to jump into a deep pit and pull the pit in after us. That is what it really amounts to.

Mr. President, I may overemphasize the importance of this thing to the American people. I hope I may be regarded as sincere and earnest in my position as the Senator from California in his support. We have been in the war for 2 months. For 4½ years the people of China, almost literally with their bare hands, have fought the aggressions of the treacherous Japanese. I recently talked with a man who had spent 2 years in China, and who had himself seen 26,000 injured Chinese coming back from the war fronts. Out of the 26,000, not 6 of them whimpered or complained.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. Do not ask me to yield now.

The Chinese have been in the war for 4½ years. They are a part of the front of civilization which must be preserved. For 2½ years the people of England have been fighting almost with their backs against the wall. For almost a year they suffered bombardments which destroyed their homes, their churches, and their lands. If the Germans had kept up that bombardment for another week nobody today knows what the result might have been.

We have been in the war for 2 months. We have seen the Philippines practically taken, with General MacArthur and his heroic American and Filipino soldiers fighting to delay the disaster. At this

moment nobody knows what the fate of General MacArthur and his soldiers will be. We hear the impatient cry, "Why not send assistance to General MacArthur?" God knows, there is nobody in this Government, from the President down, who would not be glad to send reinforcements to General MacArthur if they could get there.

We have seen the disaster at Pearl Harbor, which was the beginning of our entry into this war. We have seen the loss of Singapore. Today we see the Japanese monster crawling over Sumatra, Borneo, and Java. Within 24 hours the Japanese have bombarded Australia, and enemy vessels have gone down near the Panama Canal to attack an island in the Caribbean.

Soon we shall have appropriated \$72,000,000,000 within 2 months to carry on this fight. Is it any wonder that the American people are disturbed? Their hearts are heavy. They are determined to win this war. They sit in their offices or on their farms and around their firesides and see the fall of Manila. They see General MacArthur driven back to Corregidor. They see the fall of Singapore. They see the United Nations driven back in Libya and along the entire coast of the Mediterranean Sea; and they see the Congress of the United States talking about and passing pension bills, which cannot aid the people in their determination to win this war no matter how long it takes. Is it any wonder that the American people are disturbed in their hearts?

I do not say that as any reflection upon either my colleagues here or my former colleagues in another body. There are things that are hanging heavy over the American people that are infinitely more important than any pension to anybody.

Last September we voted to pension some retired employees of the Panama Canal. There are now pending before the Congress of the United States pension bills of all sorts which in normal times would appeal to our generosity or our sense of justice. In the midst of this great crisis, with all the reverses we have sustained up to date and the reverses we shall be compelled to sustain for the next few months before our force is brought into play in this world-wide battle front, if we are compelled to talk about pensions, in God's name what will we be required to talk about in the nature of pensions when this war is over, assuming that we are able to win? If we do not win, not a pension law on the statute books will be worth the paper on which it is written.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia is chairman of the Finance Committee. In a few weeks we shall have to sit in session after session to try to raise the money to meet what we hope will be one-third of the expense of conducting this war. That will not be the last tax bill to be brought here. Nobody knows how long this war will last. Nobody knows whether it will last 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years. We already know that it will be 1943 before we can construct airplanes, tanks, anti-aircraft guns, and ships in such a mass that we can take the offensive on a broad

scale in meeting the enemy. We are now turning out a ship a day. In a little while we shall be turning out two ships a day; and before next Christmas we shall be turning out three ships a day to carry supplies to the world-wide battlefield.

We are now in the process of registering 9,000,000 American men; and before it is over the war may require all 9,000,000 of them, before we can drive back the hordes of oppression and brutality, and can preserve not only the United States but the Western Hemisphere, with its thousands of miles of coast line which we in advance have not been able to fortify against attack, as everyone in the United States knows.

We need not delude ourselves into thinking that we can pay for and can endure all this hardship and this expenditure with one more tax bill. There may be three more, there may be four more tax bills. No one knows how many more tax bills we shall be required to pass if the war lasts 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years. Yet, Mr. President, and I say this with the deepest respect for everyone, it is a circumstance over which we may not have had any control; certainly we have none now—in the midst of this vast, world-wide, global contest, which is so vast that the average American cannot contemplate all that it means—he tries to keep his eyes on the battlefronts in the Pacific, in the Atlantic, in Africa, in Europe, but the conflict is so enormous and so immense that it is no wonder that he becomes confused about it, and wonders, after all, what is happening, and he cannot be told everything, because he cannot be told without the enemy being told—we might as well make up our minds that we shall have to steel ourselves against this situation; and in the midst of all this, Mr. President, we are seriously asked here to add a minimum of another \$1,150,000,000 to the charges on the United States Treasury.

We are undertaking to put into effect in every factory and every business in America a voluntary pay-roll system by which, out of the wages and salaries of employees all over the Nation, money will be held out to buy bonds of the United States Treasury. In addition, there is being agitated in the country a proposal that the Congress of the United States shall levy a compulsory pay-roll tax by which there shall be taken out of the wages of every employee and every man who draws a salary in this country a certain percentage of his wages, as taxes to go into the Treasury.

Those matters will be given the consideration to which they are entitled when they come before the respective committees dealing with the subjects; but I ask the Senate in all sincerity and in all fairness, without regard to politics, without regard to whether any of us is returned here—and that is a matter which is unimportant as compared to the preservation of our institutions—I ask the Members of the Senate in all fairness not to put the Senate of the United States, the Congress of the United States, in a position in which its sincerity, or even its integrity, may be doubted by the 130,000,000 people of the United

States, who on every Sabbath repair to their altars, without regard to religious denomination, and pray to Almighty God that our institutions may be preserved. I ask the Members of this great body—and it is a great body; it is almost the last and final rampart of the processes of democracy in the world—not to cast a vote that would give to any American the right to say that we are dealing in a frivolous and irresponsible and careless way with the destiny of our Republic.

These other things can wait until we have determined whether the things most valuable to all of us—our liberty, our rights, and our way of life—have been preserved. If they are preserved, there will be time enough to consider the domestic problems which are on the hearts of many of us, but which, in my judgment, must wait until the greater task has been performed.

I apologize to the Senate for taking up so much of its time.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The Senator from Kentucky has just referred to the pension bills on the calendar. I desire to say that about a year ago the Spanish War veterans asked for and endorsed several Spanish War veterans' pension relief bills. Since Pearl Harbor, the same good association of Spanish War veterans have requested that no action be taken on any pension affecting them until after this emergency is over.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. That is an action worthy of the organization to which the Senator refers.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I seek some information. I attempted to inquire about the matter by reason of some remarks made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], who indicated that he did not feel that he could vote for anything of this kind in the future. If the pensions and retirement funds provided for Federal judges or Army and Navy officers come in the Budget every year, under what heading in the Budget do they come? Do they come in the various appropriation bills?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose they come in the various appropriation bills dealing with the judiciary and the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. BONE. I may be in error, because I am drawing on my memory; but it seems to me that I have seen the figure of approximately \$9,000,000-plus, perhaps closer to \$10,000,000, for pensions and pay for retired naval officers—admirals and the like—who contribute nothing; and I wonder if we will vote such sums in the future. We have been voting several million dollars annually for retirement pay and pensions for retired Army officers, and I wonder if we are going to vote such sums in the future. Similar sums have been voted as retirement pay for members of the Foreign Service of the State Department. I wonder if we are going to vote for such sums in the future, and, if that is to be our attitude, whether

there is to be a reexamination of the whole field of retirement pay and pensions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I cannot speak for any other Senator as to how he will vote in the future on retirement payments which have been part of the law for two decades. They were enacted in time of peace, and after very careful consideration by committees. While in some senses they are analogous, I do not think they are quite on all fours with the plan, brought here in the midst of our discussion of war problems, to create a general pension for all persons in the United States coming within certain categories. Of course, I cannot speak for any other Senator as to how he will vote on any of these matters in the future.

Mr. BONE. I quite understand that; but the Senator has pointed out that the proposal for pensions for Congress will cost about \$80,000 a year, and that is a sufficient burden to justify the debate. Yet we have all these other retirement allowances, which are very sizable amounts; and I was wondering whether they should not come under the scrutiny of Senate committees in order to determine whether they should be continued. Otherwise, we shall put ourselves in the position of challenging an expenditure of \$80,000 a year as a desolating circumstance in these trying times, and of permitting expenditures of other millions upon millions of dollars to remain not only unchecked, but with no consideration whatever given to them. I do not challenge them, but the fact is that money is being paid out.

I merely wondered if the matter is to be scrutinized. I understand that the Senator from Georgia suggested that there should be some investigation of the whole system of retirement annuities and pension payments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that of course Congress has a right to investigate all such matters, and to deny such payments in the future if it sees fit to do so. I do not think this furor over congressional pensions arose because of the amount involved, whether it be \$80,000 or \$100,000 or whatever the amount may be. I think it arose because of the definite conviction on the part of the American people regarding the impropriety of enacting such a pension plan at this time. Whether it costs \$80,000 or \$100,000 or \$40,000 I do not think is important.

I do not mean to say that that is an indictment of anybody who sincerely believes in the economic and actuarial soundness of a retirement system for members of the legislative branch of the Government, but I think the people felt that it was an improper time to deal with it, and that it was improper at this time, and they raised this objection to it more on account of the principle and the policy involved than on account of the amount involved.

Mr. BONE. I saw a great many stories in which it was suggested that the provision would cost \$30,000,000 or more, and that claim was emphasized as well as the legitimate arguments against the provision. The term "\$31,000,000" was used.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that is true, of course, it was a gross misrepresentation.

Mr. BONE. The Senator is right about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I think the American people would have felt the same way about the matter if the amount had been only \$25,000. That is my honest opinion.

Mr. BONE. Does not that immediately raise the question of reexamining the propriety of giving full retirement pay to judges, and three-fourths pay to Army and Navy officers and State Department employees?

Mr. BARKLEY. Anybody can legitimately argue that.

Mr. BONE. That is true. Whatever else is in the picture, or whatever may be the moral implications arising out of the payment of so many dollars and so many cents, the fact remains that the money will be paid out of the Treasury. I have not heard any adverse comments on it here, and I wondered if we were simply going to pass it over as something of no consequence.

The thing the Senator from California is talking about is the suffering and misery of a great many persons who have been victims of economic adversity. I am prepared to believe that many of them are in nowise responsible. There are a great many factors in people's lives that make them victims of their economic environment, and they really present a pathetic picture. I have discussed on this floor many times the plight of families in the low-income group in this country, and I have a great compassion in my heart for them.

I do not think this congressional retirement amounts to much. It would not mean anything to me, because I probably would not and could not come under it; but when a furor is raised over \$80,000 a year, I think we at least owe it to ourselves to inquire whether paying nearly \$10,000,000 a year to admirals who retire, and Army and Navy officers who retire, is worthy of a second thought.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the \$80,000 really entered into the feeling of the American people on the subject. I may be wrong, but that is the way I feel about it.

Mr. BONE. I am free to say to the Senator that I should not have thought of it, either, except that I saw the amount of \$31,000,000 stressed in many newspaper stories, and I know that was partly responsible, because I think we can all agree that many persons were influenced by what they thought was the cost of congressional retirement.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon. I desire to conclude very soon, however.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to address a request to the majority leader, prompted by my realization of the dire condition of our Nation, and the belief that the Senate should proceed about its business and expedite the consideration of these bills. I request the majority

leader to hold the Senate in session tonight without recess until we shall have disposed of the Downey amendment to the Byrd amendment, and the Byrd amendment itself.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the request of the Senator. So far as I am concerned, the suggestion meets with my entire approval. I hope we can get a vote on both amendments very shortly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Several Senators have suggested to me that the tremendous tension in the Nation and in Congress might be relieved if we could get a vote upon the Byrd amendment so that all the people of the Nation would know that that tremendous sacrifice has been made by Congress. In order to help alleviate the anxious hearts and to dispose of this issue, so that the Nation, at least on the west coast, may perhaps sleep more peacefully tonight, I am willing to make this offer, I will withdraw my amendment as an amendment to the Byrd amendment upon the agreement that it may again be submitted as an amendment to the bill, which would allow a vote upon the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that it does not require an agreement. The Senator's amendment is in order as an amendment to the bill, and it is not necessary to offer it as an amendment to the pending Byrd amendment; so, if the Senator now withdraws his amendment from the Byrd amendment, he is at liberty to offer it as an amendment to the bill if he sees fit.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. The dispute or misunderstanding between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Georgia and myself as to figures is a rather important personal matter to me. I believe that tomorrow I can present documentary data from the Social Security Board which will entirely clarify and satisfy the situation. I should like to appeal to the majority leader and to my distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], if we dispose of the Byrd amendment, to let us consider the other amendment tomorrow. If Senators want to stay here tonight, there will be nothing to do but to stay here tonight and discuss it. I believe, however, that it could very fairly go over until tomorrow if the dreadful tension of the Byrd amendment can be relieved. So I withdraw my amendment as an amendment to the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us have a vote, then, on the Byrd amendment. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent. He requested the junior Senator from Virginia to insert in the RECORD a letter explaining how he would vote on the pending question if present. I ask that the letter be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1942.
Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I deeply regret being absent on official business while your repeal resolution of the so-called congressional pension recently passed is before the Senate. And I want to say quite frankly that I feel that this provision of that appropriation bill was, to put it mildly, surreptitiously inserted, and if that charge is not justified, certainly it is a fact that many Members of both branches of the Congress did not know that it was in the bill at all.

Now, I realize that it is our business to know what is in every bill, and certainly no one scrutinizes all the legislation that comes before them more carefully than I do. And in that sense I am glad (if that is the right word) to point out that I was absent from the Capitol due to illness when this legislation came before the Senate. And most certainly I would have voiced a strong objection, had I been able to be present on that occasion, to that particular provision, as well as having voted against it.

In other words, I am wholeheartedly in support of your resolution and, by the same token, feel very strongly that Members of the Senate who receive the salary they do, namely, \$10,000 a year, should not ask for any pension at all, especially as our services are in quite a different category than those who quite rightly, under civil-service provisions, should receive pensions and other emoluments.

I hope your resolution carries, and I am sure it will, and I am anxious to make this record of my feelings in the matter.

With kind regards,
Most sincerely,

W. WARREN BARBOUR.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I did not enter into the discussion of the so-called pension bill. I voted against the bill. After I had voted I was requested by radio station WISN, of Milwaukee, Wis., to express my position in regard to that matter. I did so, and my position is expressed in the following speech, which was made over that station:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, tonight, at the invitation of the management of this station and in response to their request, I am happy to discuss briefly with you that portion of the new Civil Service Retirement Act which makes provision for annuities to be paid Members of Congress who have served 5 years or more and who are over 62 years of age and out of service.

This new Civil Service Retirement Act (Public Law No. 411) passed the House of Representatives on December 1, 1941, and passed the Senate on January 19, 1942. Subsequently the Senate amendments were accepted by the House on January 21, 1942, and the bill became law when the President signed the measure on January 24, 1942.

At the outset, let me state that I felt it was most unfortunate that the provision for Members of Congress should have been inserted in this measure. There were worth-while provisions for civil-service employees in the bill itself, but those of us who opposed the provision for congressional retirement had no alternative except to vote against the entire bill. Public office is a public trust and calls for service to the Nation, not to self.

I opposed the idea of considering civil-service provisions for Members of Congress at this time, and I voted against the bill. My reasons can be stated briefly as follows:

(1) I felt at the time, and still feel, that there is a principle involved. No one person

should be in a position where he would vote himself a benefit out of the public funds. To do so would legalize a very dangerous practice.

(2) I felt that to consider such a matter now was very inopportune. We have a war on our hands. The winning of the war should engage all our consideration, and legislators should not be thinking about their personal interests or those of any special-interest groups.

(3) Another reason why I opposed this inclusion of legislators in the civil-service benefit program was this: I have a deep conviction that our whole system of pensions should be studied and renovated. We have now in the Nation what might be called "special privileged pension groups." The expense item of taking care of those groups is becoming enormous. The poor taxpayer, the man or the woman who for over 50 years, for example, has supported Government by the sweat of his brow, is generally not included in any of these groups. This calls for a thorough study of the situation, and during that period we should under no consideration continue to include new special interest groups in Federal pension schemes.

Let me repeat, I voted against the measure which provided for pensions for Members of Congress, and I will support the movement to repeal this provision.

I believe that Congress must repeal this measure as soon as possible. The measure must be repealed in order that public faith in our democratic system may be sustained.

It should be repealed to erase the impression that Members of Congress are reaching out for benefits at a time when all of our strength and all of our money is needed to win the war.

Probably in all the history of the United States no more inappropriate moment could have been selected for the consideration of a proposal for congressional pensions. How can Members of Congress ask citizens to sacrifice for national security while they vote special benefits for themselves?

At no time—much less than in these crucial hours—should Members of Congress take advantage of their power to increase their own compensation or their own security. There is a constitutional provision which forbids a legislator to resign and then accept a Federal job which was created or given a boost in pay during his service in Congress. That is an excellent rule based on an ethical principle. That ethical principle applies with equal force against Congressmen voting benefits to themselves.

In other words, if Congress had a long and careful study of this problem and then decided that a pension system for legislators was desirable, the least it could do would be to apply that system, not to themselves but to future legislators thereafter elected.

Let me make it clear, however, that I myself am not in favor of applying the system to Members of Congress at present or in the future unless, of course, all citizens past a certain age are covered.

There is a great deal of confusion about the congressional provision in the civil-service retirement law. As it was analyzed on the floor of the Senate by Senator BYRD, it appeared that it would be possible for Members of the Senate who had a long tenure of office to obtain a \$4,100 annuity by payment of \$140, according to the provision of this amendment to the civil-service retirement law, if they retired from office on December 31, 1942.

Of course, this is an extreme example. As a matter of fact, it is so extreme that the Civil Service Commission denied that it was possible.

Senator BYRD, however, questioned the Civil Service Commission officials very sharply on this point, and I understand that they have now agreed that Senator BYRD's analysis is substantially correct. In any event, however, it cannot be denied that the best course at

the present time is to wipe out the entire amendment by a straightforward repeal bill.

The reason we provide annuities for employees in the executive and civil-service branches of the Federal Government is because they frequently spend their entire lives in the Federal service. Members of Congress are elected by the people. They are here today and they may be gone tomorrow, and while in office Congressmen and Senators draw \$10,000 a year. This salary cannot be increased during a legislator's term of office. To me, this retirement bill is in itself an unlawful increase.

The very nature of the legislator's job excludes the idea of permanent tenure. As a matter of fact, service in Congress usually increases the earning capacity of the Member. Once a Member of Congress is retired to private life he resumes the status of a citizen. He has no official standing and he has no real claim on the Government. It is difficult to understand why a Member of Congress should be treated as a career man.

There are already a number of bills in the legislative hopper seeking to repeal the congressional retirement provision.

I will support this repeal movement, and I sincerely hope that it will receive support of a majority in Congress. Certainly this very controversial question did not receive the study and was not given the debate which it deserved. There was almost no discussion in the House of Representatives and no record vote, though we did have an opportunity to vote against it in the Senate—an opportunity which I was glad to utilize to express my opposition.

Under the provisions of the bill as it passed, a Member of the Senate or House who has served 5 years and who is 62 years old—or younger, if disabled—becomes eligible to retire on an annuity January 1 next by payment of this year's premium.

According to general interpretation, the pensions would range from \$58 to \$350 a month, according to the length of service.

It cannot be denied that the propriety of making the annuities applicable to legislators now in Congress certainly is open to question. There may even be some legal conflict with that part of the Constitution which prohibits Members of Congress during their terms of office from taking jobs which they had a hand in creating. This is another reason why this measure should be repealed.

We are engaged in a great war effort, the result of which may determine whether this Nation and other free nations of the earth will continue to remain free. This is our big job. May we concentrate on it and not be diverted by legislation of this type from our course, to the end that victory may be ours.

Thank you.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the amendment reported by the committee. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. CHAVEZ (when Mr. HATCH's name was called). The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "yea."

MR. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and will vote. I vote "yea."

I also desire to say that I am informed that if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr.

BARBOUR] were present he would vote "yea."

MR. GEORGE (when Mr. RUSSELL's name was called). The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent. If he were present he would vote "yea" on the pending amendment.

MR. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

MR. GILLETTE (when Mr. TUNNELL's name was called). I am requested to announce that junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is necessarily absent, keeping a previously made engagement in the State of Iowa. I am further requested to announce that if present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

MR. HILL. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has been called to the State of Pennsylvania on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is also absent on official business.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] has been called to one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Arkansas. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

MR. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

MR. AUSTIN. My colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent in the hospital because of a hip injury. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is detained at his home by illness.

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—75

Austin	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.
Bailey	Connally	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Danaher	Kilgore
Bankhead	Davis	Langer
Barkley	Downey	Lee
Blibo	Doxey	Lodge
Bone	Ellender	Lucas
Brewster	George	McCarran
Brooks	Gerry	McFarland
Brown	Gillette	McKellar
Bulow	Glass	McNary
Bunker	Green	Maloney
Burton	Gurney	Maybank
Butler	Hayden	Millikin
Eyrd	Herring	Murdoch
Capper	Hill	Murray
Caraway	Holman	Norris
Chavez	Hughes	O'Daniel

O'Mahoney	Stewart	Vandenberg
Overton	Taft	Van Nuys
Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	Walsh
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Rosier	Tobey	White
Schwartz	Truman	Wiley
Smathers	Tydings	Willis

NAYS—5

Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
La Follette	Nye	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Hatch	Spencer
Andrews	Fepper	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Reynolds	Tunnell
Bridges	Russell	Wagner
Chandler	Shipstead	
Guffey	Smith	

So Mr. BYRD's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the pending amendment the following:

(e) No person otherwise eligible to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be paid any retirement benefits under the provisions of such act for any period during which such person is receiving any benefits under a retirement system of any State or any political subdivision of any State.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the pending amendment? The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York in terms is an amendment to the pending amendment. What is the pending amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment to which the Chair assumes the Senator from New York is referring is the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute. The Chair asks the Senator from New York whether that is correct.

Mr. MEAD. The Chair is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would merely prevent one who is a member of a State or local retirement system from drawing benefits from the Federal retirement system. It will have no application to Members of Congress if the amendment which has just been adopted shall be finally approved by the other body of the Congress and signed by the President. It will, however, prevent men from qualifying for a retirement annuity in more than one public system. There is a possibility of that happening under existing law. I found that to be the fact in my own case. After I communicated with the authorities of the State of New York and with the Federal authorities, I was made aware of a condition which I thought did not exist. I stated in the debates on the bill just passed that I was a disinterested party, that I had no opportunity of qualifying because I was in a State system. I have learned that there is a possibility of an individual becoming an annuitant in more than one public system.

I merely submit the amendment so that no one who qualifies for a Federal pension will be able to qualify for a State or for a local pension or perhaps for a retirement benefit under the State Department. It occurs to me that one benefit of this kind, so far as it applies to the civil-service retirement plans, is sufficient.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator state what effect his amendment will have on retired officers of the Army and the Navy who are receiving their retirement pay?

Mr. MEAD. It would have no effect upon them at all.

Mr. WALSH. If they receive pensions or annuities from various States, will it affect them?

Mr. MEAD. No. It merely provides that anyone qualifying for a Federal retirement will not be given a Federal retirement if he has also qualified for a State or municipal benefit. It makes no reference to the existing Federal systems other than the one we are discussing now.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I understood the Senator to say that, under the amendment, one would have the right of election, but under the language of the bill he stated one was barred from any such election.

Mr. MEAD. Under the terms of my amendment, one could not qualify for retirement in the State of Rhode Island and at the same time qualify for retirement under the Federal system. It merely pertains to three systems which it mentions. One cannot qualify for a local, a municipal or a State benefit and at the same time be eligible for Federal benefits.

Mr. GREEN. But can he elect?

Mr. MEAD. I suppose he could elect. He could withdraw from the State pension system and participate in the Federal system.

Mr. GREEN. It seems to be a question whether under the language of the amendment he can elect.

Mr. MEAD. It merely bars more than one pension for those who qualify under the Federal civil-service plan.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from New York does not seem to be very sure whether he can or cannot elect.

Mr. MEAD. Yes, he can elect. I would say there would probably be regulations issued which would make him eligible for Federal retirement if he got out of local or State retirement funds. But he can only be in one. If one wants benefits from the Federal civil service retirement plan he cannot receive benefits from any other.

Mr. GREEN. I understand that he can only receive benefits from one, but I am not yet clear whether he would have the right to elect under the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I would say he would have the right to elect, for it does not bar him from electing, because it merely says he may not receive more than one benefit.

Mr. GREEN. Will the Senator from New York read his proposed amendment?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from New York conferred with the legislative drafting service on that very point. We are merely trying to prevent a person from qualifying for a municipal or a State benefit and also for the Federal civil-service pension. We mention no other systems. We merely hold that a person can draw only one civil-service retirement benefit. We permit him, as a result I believe of the language of the amendment, to elect which he will qualify for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I notice that the language of the amendment is "eligible" to receive a pension.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It does not say "receive" a State pension. It says "eligible" to receive one. A man may be eligible to receive a State pension and therefore would forever be barred from receiving a Federal pension under the language of the amendment.

Mr. MEAD. By comparing the language of the amendment with the law it was determined that that was the best way of depriving an individual from receiving a double or a triple income. He could not be eligible for the Federal benefits if he is being paid State or municipal benefits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He might be eligible for a State pension and not receive a State pension.

Mr. MEAD. The amendment also contains the word "receive."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. When the amendment was read I did not hear the word "receive."

Mr. MEAD. Yes, that word is in the amendment. I do not have the amendment before me, but that word is in it. We took up that matter with two representatives of the legislative drafting service and we went into the question very thoroughly, and I think the language is very definite on that point. I should like to have my distinguished colleague get a copy of the amendment and read it, because I am sure he will agree with me on that point.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has the floor. Will he not ask that the amendment be read again?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following language:

(e) No person otherwise eligible to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be paid any retirement benefits under the provisions of such act for any period during which such person is receiving any benefits under a retirement system of any State, or any political subdivision of any State.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I seek information about one matter. Assuming a state of facts

like this to exist, what would the answer be under the Senator's amendment? Suppose a man was a veteran of World War No. 1 and receiving a pension. In recent years he had been employed by a city or a State into whose coffers he had paid a certain amount each year as a contribution toward a retirement fund. What effect would the amendment have on his status as a recipient of a Federal pension for war services and a pension from the city or county or State by reason of his services to that body?

Mr. MEAD. It would not have any effect on any pension for war service or on any other pension fund except the Civil Service Retirement Act. A man may draw a pension from the railroad retirement fund. He may draw a pension from the Coast Guard. And yet this amendment would not apply to him. The proposed language merely means that one cannot draw a pension from a municipal civil-service fund and also from the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. One cannot draw a benefit from a State fund and from the Federal fund.

Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senate has decided the issue of congressional pensions. I have been calling it retirement pay until now, but from now on I want to join the majority in calling it pension.

Mr. President, I could not see how I could maintain my position, my integrity, or my self-respect as the agent of the Senate, as the spokesman of our committee, and come in here one day and defend a measure as being in the interest of national defense because it covered a very large group of employees, a measure that was in the interest of national defense because it extended the age limits from 62 or 65 to 70 years, and permitted departments which are right up against it for personnel to retain such persons.

I could not defend a measure last week and tell the Senate that it was increasing revenues from \$67,000,000 to approximately \$100,000,000, and then come in this week and tell the Senate that it was a great drain on the Treasury.

But, Mr. President, I am very glad, very happy tonight that this body has had the opportunity to vote. It leaves me free now to make my personal opinions known on this particular issue. I never thought I could qualify under the provision. I was not interested in the matter from a personal standpoint.

I shall not be interested from now on, insofar as I am concerned. But, Mr. President, when the time comes, I hope it will again have the attention of the committees of Congress and that it will be decided upon in a manner that will be for the public welfare. I hope that if a retirement plan is ever adopted it will be actuarially sound; that it will be an example for all other retirement plans to follow; and that it will be one that may entice other agencies to follow our lead and to enact a similar program that will increase the revenues of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, I want to have inserted in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, some of the comments that have

been made in the last day or two with reference to this legislation.

I have before me a statement which was made last night by Lowell Thomas. I quote a portion of it for the benefit of my colleagues:

Another specter is that loudly ridiculed issue of pensions, which filled the mail bags of Congressmen with a heavier mass of abusive letters than they have seen in many a long time. I have been getting my share of it in the last few days for having relayed the information that some people believe it would be salutary and dignified for Presidents who do not happen to be rich men to lead dignified lives after their terms expire. I pointed out the tragedies of President Thomas Jefferson and of the last days of President Grant—and did I catch it in the mail for that!

As a matter of fact, there is a real serious misapprehension about the pension law which Congress passed. It did not propose to give every Congressman a handsome income regardless of how long he had served. Only a lawmaker with a 35-year record would have been entitled to the maximum, \$5,000 a year.

That is an exaggeration in some cases.

A man who had been in Congress 5 years would get six or eight hundred a year. That's what the shouting was really all about. It looks as though the argument would soon be only academic anyway, for the solons, as the copy desk calls them, are getting all set to repeal the bill. The Senate today voted to allow the Committee on Civil Service to report a repeal measure tonight and the Upper Chamber will vote on it tomorrow. In this issue, too, the desire for unity has been loudly mentioned as the motive.

Last night in Washington Radio Commentator Morgan Beatty had this to say:

Congressmen are about to repeal that nettlesome "Pensions for Congressmen" law, too. They could have tried to argue with voters who wrote in condemning the law, for it is actually not the "steal" a lot of people think it is, but there's no point in arguing now. And so the repeal movement should begin to grind through Congress before the week end is out.

This morning the Washington Post, among other things, had this to say:

The chances strongly favor speedy repeal of the legislation making Members of Congress eligible for voluntary inclusion in the Federal contributory retirement system. However, the current debate in the Senate shows very plainly that many Senators regard themselves as the hapless victims of a campaign of deliberate misrepresentation and vilification. Stung by public criticism, they are fearful of the effect of the pensions vote upon their political futures as well as upon public morale. Primarily for those reasons—and not because they regard pensions for themselves as wrong in principle—many legislators are prepared to reverse their votes and approve a repeal measure.

It is true that exaggerated statements regarding the size of the pensions and the cost to the Government (which would probably be small) have gained currency. A few minor changes in the pension law would meet criticisms of this sort. But the issue goes much deeper.

It then makes the point that Members of Congress are different from anybody else and therefore should not be permitted to become participants in this system.

The bill in question was approved all along the line and under those conditions I was designated, and likewise agreed, to handle it on the floor of the Senate as the spokesman of the Civil

Service Committee and the agent of the Senate. In that capacity I was acting for the committee on a measure that was not mine.

As I stated a moment ago, I am glad this issue is settled, and I am glad the Senate has settled it as it has. I am glad to be relieved from the embarrassing position in which I have been since, as the agent of the Senate, I reported the bill to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to have it known that no matter what the situation may be, I was never personally concerned with this bill. Coming, as I do, under the New York system, and believing in it as I do, I want to have it known that Senators who have no independent income and who are not considered wealthy men, should some day have the privilege of retirement in an actuarially sound contributory system, one which would not cost the Government a penny, if we want to make it such a system.

Mr. President, the issue is settled. It probably will not come up again for some time. I hope it does not again arise while the emergency is on. Although I was appointed on a Presidential committee to study retirement, I never pioneered, nor did I ever introduce legislation for congressional retirement or congressional pensions. The section repealed was not my plan.

Before I am through, Mr. President, I wish to commend the majority leader for listening to my appeal that he refrain from attaching the measure introduced by the distinguished Senator from Virginia as a rider to the pending naval bill. I am glad that he gave our committee an opportunity to consider it.

I cooperated wholeheartedly and presided again last night at hearings to expedite the report on the Byrd bill. I did everything I could to bring it to the Senate without delay so that you could make your decision. We went to work diligently after we were given the privilege and reported it expeditiously. The democratic processes were given an opportunity to be served. We brought out some valuable information.

In the two sessions we could not find anybody who was opposed to the bill. Representatives of hundreds of thousands of men and women all over America who took this matter up in their conventions and favored it appeared before the House committee in hearings which ran for many days, covering a period of 2 or 3 months. They came before us yesterday and pleaded with us for the retention of the retirement feature covering elective officials.

Our committee reported the bill back to the Senate today. Throughout this entire matter, from the time that the Civil Service Committee designated me to sponsor the measure on the floor of the Senate until today, when the Senate acted, I was duty bound to advocate the measure as it was recommended by the committee. Now that the Senate has acted and has repealed the provision which has caused so much interference with the harmonious workings of the Senate, I am released of any further obligation which attached to my position as a representative of the committee.

I feel that throughout all of these proceedings, acting in my representative capacity, I devoted all of my energies in as diligent a manner as possible to fulfill my obligations. Now that the Senate has acted and the controversial section has been repealed by this body, I have no further connection with the measure in question, and I am able to make my own position clear. From this point forward I am free, along with the other Members of the Senate, to devote all of my time to the war effort.

Mr. President, appreciating, as I do, the opportunity given to us by the majority leader, I now wish to turn to him for the same privilege for the distinguished junior Senator from California. The junior Senator from California, in a most conscientious and sincere manner, has endeavored to obtain hearings before a standing committee of the Senate authorized to consider measures such as he has been discussing today; and yet, except perhaps for a special committee, he has not been granted the privilege of the hearings to which he has been entitled insofar as the bill he has been discussing this afternoon is concerned.

I believe that if we want to maintain the democratic processes and prove that our democracy can function, we should accord justice to the persistence, integrity, and conscientiousness of the distinguished junior Senator from California in connection with the particular bill which we are discussing this afternoon. It ought to be made the subject of hearings.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

In connection with the bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, the majority leader required the chairman of our committee and other members of the committee to take the floor and make their decision right here—an affirmative, positive decision—that we would grant hearings at once and without delay. I think that with respect to the particular measure which is before us today the junior Senator from California ought to be given the opportunity for hearings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator probably is not aware of the fact that in the last session the Senator from California asked on the floor that he be assured that hearings would be given on this subject, in which he is so greatly interested.

Mr. MEAD. On this subject, I am speaking about this particular bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. On a bill which he had then introduced, the same bill with some variations.

The Senate Finance Committee held hearings beginning about the first of December. I do not now remember how long they lasted, but I think there were hearings to the extent desired at that time. If the Senator from California desires further hearings before that com-

mittee on the subject, I think I can assure him that they will be accorded. I speak in the presence of the chairman of the committee, who, with the committee of which I am a member, accorded the right to be heard in December. The hearings occurred about the first week in December. Then, of course, as the Senator knows, Pearl Harbor came, and everything gave way to that. But if the Senator from California or any other Senator wants to be heard or to have witnesses appear before the Finance Committee, before which the matter has been pending, I think it certain that every opportunity will be given to have the matter developed before that committee to the extent desired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Just as soon as I make one statement. I am glad to have the assurance from the able majority leader. I admit that there have been hearings but I do not believe there have been hearings on this particular measure. There is a great deal of conflict about the cost, as was emphasized in the debate on the floor. I know that a special committee was appointed to treat with this subject; but it occurs to me that it is a very important matter, that it is a vital matter, that it is something that we ought to have completed before the end of the emergency. We could study it now. I think that hearings should be initiated without delay on this particular subject; and in our spare time or when we are not considering emergency war measures we could go into the subject and get it in proper shape and bring it before the Senate so that it would not have to be attached as a rider to some other appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator has said, and I am interested in having the matter developed and given every possible consideration. The bill on which the Finance Committee held a hearing early in December differed from this matter in that that bill had in it a provision for raising money to bear the expenses of the plan, whereas the amendment here does not contain such a provision. I think the matter is entitled to consideration. It is a matter on which there must be study. I do not think we can really pass on the matter intelligently here on the floor on the spur of the moment, and as a rider to another bill. It is a matter that is entitled to be considered on its own merits, and not thrown in suddenly as a rider to some other bill—a proceeding which in a sense tends to complicate, if not to embarrass, the advocacy of a comprehensive measure on the subject in a way in which I do not think it is entitled to have to suffer.

Mr. MEAD. The able majority leader will recall how I objected to the hasty consideration of the legislation offered by the junior Senator from Virginia, how I pleaded that hearings be held, that it be referred to the proper committee, and that it be reported back to the Senate without delay. I am consistent, I believe, in seeking the same course for the legislation introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, I compliment the Senator from New York, and I have heretofore complimented him and the chairman of the Civil Service Committee on the prompt consideration and prompt action and the sincere and honest course they pursued in regard to the matter which we have presently disposed of; and I can assure the Senator from New York and any other Senator that every opportunity will be given to the advocates of the pension plan now under consideration to study it and to present it to the committee, and, as the Senator says, at a time when we are not harassed by important war legislation, take it up and consider it on its merit.

Mr. MEAD. I yield now to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, perhaps inadvertently, certainly left the impression on the Senate that the Finance Committee had refused the Senator from California a hearing on this proposition and this bill. The fact is that the Finance Committee gave a hearing to the Senator from California on the only bill that he had introduced.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The committee heard every witness who desired to be heard, and presumably heard every witness whom the Senator from California desired to introduce, and adjourned the hearing with the understanding—at least, so I understood, and I think the committee completely understood to the same effect—that the Senator from California was going to prepare some amendments to submit to the committee, on which further hearings could be held. If the Senator from California has ever prepared such amendments, I am not aware of them. I am certain that the Finance Committee has never declined to hold a hearing on any important subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will; but first I ask the Senator from Kentucky to permit me to complete my statement.

No one has ever had an opportunity to know just what this particular proposition is, except from hearing it read at the desk today, because it has not been printed, and only two or three mimeographed copies have been available. But I can assure the Senator from New York that the Senator from California, or any other Senator who has an important measure for consideration before the Finance Committee, can get a hearing before that committee at any time mutually convenient.

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to have that assurance.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have in my hands a printed copy of the hearings held before the Finance Committee on December 1, 2, and 15, 1941, consisting of 147 pages of printed testimony taken at the proceedings held on those days on Senate bill 1932, introduced by the junior Senator from California.

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to have that information; and I want it known that I have no complaint against the

present chairman of the Finance Committee or his predecessors in that enviable position, or against the committee itself. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from California, in a forthright and exemplary fashion, has tried time and time again to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. The proposal that he brings to the Senate is a reasonable one. It may not be properly timed; but, nevertheless, it is a proposal which should have our consideration.

I believe, Mr. President, that we should liberalize our pension system, our social-security system. I believe that if we have such liberalization ready, it will make its contribution to our national economy after this emergency is over. I believe, Mr. President, that, upon consideration of the measure, we might make some adjustments with reference to age requirements. We might make some adjustments, Mr. President, by reason not only of age requirements but with reference to State and Federal contributions. We might make such adjustments as will make it possible for a majority of the Members of this Chamber to give such legislation their support.

Mr. President, as I pleaded for consideration by the committee of the bill introduced by the junior Senator from California, I now plead for consideration of the bill which is before the Senate and which is sponsored by the junior Senator from California. I believe those measures should be considered by the committee, and they should be brought here on their own merits, and they should be debated and discussed and approved by the Senate of the United States. I should like to vote to liberalize pensions. I should like to vote for the measure introduced by the Senator from California, after it shall have been considered by the proper committee. I believe that we should liberalize pensions, and I hope we shall have an opportunity to do so at a very early date.

Mr. President, as has been the request of our majority leader, let us give all of our emphasis and all of our attention and all of the diligence at our command to the war effort. Let the chairmen of the various committees weigh well the bills that are before them, consider well the bills that they report, and bring in here, Mr. President, only legislation that can be vindicated in the times in which we live, and which can be defended as legislation which will have, as its first object, the winning of the war in which we are engaged. Let us, Mr. President, in a forthright manner tackle the problem which is before us, and, as has been the case, I believe, up to date, pass war-effort legislation without delay. I believe that every committee which has had such legislation referred to it has reported it to this Chamber without delay.

I believe we are practically up to date with that program. I believe we ought to keep that program up to date.

So, Mr. President, I want it understood that so far as I am concerned, whether it requires sessions by day or sessions by night, or both, I am here to give my level best, as has been the case in

the past, to legislation which concerns itself with national defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to ask the Senator, in regard to his amendment, how many Federal employees his amendment affects. Does the Senator know?

Mr. MEAD. I suppose it does not affect any of them; but there is a possibility of someone qualifying for a pension in a State and then securing a position in the Federal Government. He may even be elected to Congress, and then, after leaving Congress, secure a position in the Federal Government. His service in the Congress and his service in the Federal Government would, after a period of 15 years, make him eligible for a Federal pension; and by reason of his service in the State he might likewise be eligible, after attaining a certain age, for another pension in the State system.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But the services would not be simultaneous.

Mr. MEAD. No; the services would not be simultaneous.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They are actuarially sound, are they not?

Mr. MEAD. They are.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then why deprive a man of something he has earned?

Mr. MEAD. Simply because in the aggregate the payments to him may total more than any pension system could justify. I want to make sure that one who commands the salary that we do cannot get a pension from the State and likewise get a pension from the Nation. It occurs to me that if a pension system is actuarially sound, we ought to confine the recipient of it to one pension. That is the theory behind social security—to provide a sufficient income to enable a man to get along after his days of usefulness at work are over but not to provide him with a royalty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not see that a royalty is involved here. We have the case of a person who has earned retirement in a State after perhaps 10 or 15 years of service. He has paid for it. He has paid in the required amount. Then he enters the Federal service and he accumulates some more retirement. By what sort of reasoning does the Senator from New York deprive such a person of his Federal retirement pay, something he has earned, something to which he has a right? He ought to be treated on the same basis as other persons. These other persons perhaps have earned retirement through private life-insurance companies. They retain it. They have earned it. They have paid for it. The person that the Senator is legislating against has earned his retirement in a State and has paid for it; and yet, by the amendment which the Senator is proposing here, he is taking away from that man something he has earned. It is his right.

Mr. MEAD. If the distinguished Senator from Colorado will yield, if a man has 4 or 5 years to his credit in a munic-

ipal or a State fund, and he comes to work for the Federal Government, he may elect to join the Federal system, and he may go on to attain a maximum retirement pension, and at the same time he will be able to withdraw his money, with interest, from the fund of which he was formerly a member. If he decides to go to work for a State government, if he is employed by a municipal system, and if he takes out membership in a local or State retirement fund, he may withdraw his money from the Federal fund, with accrued interest, and he may proceed to attain for himself a very substantial retirement in the local or the State system. It occurs to me, however, that we ought not to permit benefits from more than one retirement system to be paid to those who are participants in the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended. I merely wish to prevent two or more retirement payments being permitted legally under the law.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New York if he has seen the report of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, which requested the repeal of the congressional allowance, which we voted on a little while ago.

Mr. MEAD. To be honest with my distinguished colleague, I must say that we worked so fast and so hastily to get the bill and the report before the Senate that I really have not had time to read the finished report.

Mr. BONE. I have read it. It has about 20 lines in it. The smartest man alive would not know what issues were involved, if he read the report, unless he also heard the debate on the floor. Any fair-minded person reading the report who could tell what the issues were would have to be smarter than any human being since the days of Solomon. He would have to be a million Solomons rolled into one to tell what the issues were.

I have read the report, and I defy anybody in the Senate to tell what the issues in this case are from reading the report. If that is the kind of a report that is to be submitted on the bill of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], we certainly shall be facing a most astonishing situation.

Mr. MEAD. I will state that our principal task was to get the bill before the Senate with a report as quickly as possible because we wanted the Senate to have an opportunity to repeal the law if the Senate wanted to do so. I, for one, am very happy that the Senate had that opportunity, and I aided in bringing it about quickly as well as I could.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, for the third, and, I hope, the last time, I now desire to offer my pension amendment to the pending bill. I should like to be heard by the Senate for a time, not exceeding 30 minutes, to answer some of

the arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was hoping—and I think the other Members of the Senate have been hoping—that we might dispose of this matter this afternoon and adjourn over until Monday. I do not want to work any hardship on other Members or on the Senator from California, but I thought he said it would take him only 15 minutes to answer me. I do not want to work any hardship on the Senator or on the Senate; but there is quite a sentiment in favor of staying here until we dispose of this matter. I wonder, therefore, if the Senator would not be willing to limit himself to approximately 15 minutes.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am willing to go ahead if the Senate desires, and I shall endeavor to confine myself within 15 minutes, which I think I can do if there are no interruptions, interrogatories, colloquies, controversies, arguments, discussions, and so forth.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, I will guarantee to accept the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I first desire to ask to have placed in the RECORD, without my reading it, a communication under date of November 28, 1941, from the Federal Social Security Board, signed by Mr. Falk, which I think sustains the figures I have stated here in relation to the cost of the pending pension proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, November 28, 1941.

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: In accordance with the request you made by telephone on November 22, we have compiled some tentative cost estimates which might reasonably apply to the series of old-age assistance specifications you gave me. I recapitulate these specifications as follows:

(1a) Old-age assistance to be paid to needy persons aged 65 years and over.

(1b) In the alternative, old-age assistance to be paid to needy persons aged 60 years and over.

(2) For each such recipient, whether single, married, widowed, or divorced, who is the only recipient in the family or household, the assistance payment is to be uniformly \$40 per month.

(3) For each such recipient who is one of a married couple each of whom is a recipient, the assistance payment is to be uniformly \$25 per month.

(4) Federal reimbursement to be 80 percent; State (and local) funds to provide 20 percent.

(5) Federal reimbursement to be applicable under the present \$40 maximum monthly payment per recipient.

(6) For needy recipients aged 65 years and over, assume the current percent eligible; for those aged 60 to 64, inclusive, assume alternatively, 15, 17.5, 20, and 24.6 percent eligible (the last being the current percentage of persons aged 65 and over who are old-age assistance recipients).

For the purposes of the calculation it was necessary to derive estimates of the propor-

tion of recipients who, it is assumed, would receive the \$40 payments and the proportion who would receive the \$25 payments. Such estimates were based upon available data concerning persons aged 65 or over, namely data on (a) the characteristics of recipients accepted for old-age assistance during the fiscal year 1939-40, and (b) the proportion of married persons aged 65 or over living with a spouse 65 or over, as found in our Family Composition Study. The results were then arbitrarily applied to persons aged 60 to 64, inclusive.

From such estimates it appears that the combined average monthly payment for persons aged 65 or over, or aged 60 or over, eligible for Federal reimbursement under the stated series of specifications would be about \$36 per recipient. This, I may emphasize, is a tentative figure, subject to review. Total annual expenditures for the stated series of specifications were then calculated by applying this estimated average monthly payment to specified monthly case loads. The results are shown in the tabulation included herewith. The corresponding figures from the actual experience of the old-age assistance program during the calendar year 1940 are included for convenient comparison.

As you will recall from our telephone conversation, we have used the alternative percentages (15, 17.5, 20, and 24.6) as arbitrarily assumed proportions of those aged 60 to 64 years, inclusive, who would qualify as needy recipients. I would emphasize the point that these percentages are arbitrary; it should not

necessarily be assumed, from these alternative percentages used, that the percentage of persons aged 60 to 64, inclusive, who might be eligible needy recipients will necessarily be less than the average percentage of persons aged 65 and over who are recipients under the current old-age assistance programs.

It will be evident from the tabulation that the stated series of specifications, with the indicated supplementary assumptions, imply a monthly case load of 2,200,000 recipients 65 years of age or over, and a total annual expenditure of \$952,000,000, of which \$762,000,000 would be a cost to the Federal Government. If the age limit were lowered to 60 years, the monthly case load would range from 2,900,000 to 3,400,000, the total annual expenditure from \$1,258,000,000 to \$1,453,000,000, and the annual cost to the Federal Government from \$1,006,000,000 to \$1,162,000,000—depending upon the assumed proportion of eligibles among those aged 60-64, inclusive. These figures may be compared with an average monthly case load of 2,000,000 persons aged 65 or over in the calendar year 1940, a total annual expenditure for them of \$473,000,000, and an annual Federal cost of \$235,000,000 for this program.

I hope these notes and estimates give you the information you wished to have when you first stated the inquiry and to which you again referred in our telephone conversation yesterday morning.

Sincerely yours,

I. S. FALK, Director.

[Enclosure.]

Coverage	Monthly case load	Total annual expenditures	Annual State expenditures	Annual Federal expenditures
Recipients 65 years or over in September 1941.....	2,204,000	\$952,000,000	\$190,000,000	\$762,000,000
Recipients 60 or over, on (alternative) assumptions:				
(a) If 15 percent of persons 60-64 are eligible.....	2,911,000	1,258,000,000	252,000,000	1,006,000,000
(b) If 17.5 percent of persons 60-64 are eligible.....	3,029,000	1,309,000,000	262,000,000	1,047,000,000
(c) If 20 percent of persons 60-64 are eligible.....	3,147,000	1,360,000,000	272,000,000	1,088,000,000
(d) If 24.6 percent ¹ of persons 60-64 are eligible.....	3,364,000	1,453,000,000	291,000,000	1,162,000,000

ACTUAL EXPERIENCE UNDER PRESENT PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Experience for calendar year 1940.....	1,986,000	\$473,000,000	\$238,000,000	\$235,000,000
--	-----------	---------------	---------------	---------------

¹ The proportion of persons 65 and over receiving old-age assistance in September 1941.

² Excludes recipients 60-64 in Colorado.

³ Includes \$3,000,000 of nonmatchable expenditures.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to call to the attention of the distinguished leader the fact that in his final arithmetic for the gross cost of the plan he reached approximately the same figure I reached, namely, \$1,150,000,000. But the distinguished Senator must admit that from that would be deducted the payments which the Government would otherwise have to make under the present law, which would amount to approximately \$350,000,000 in the next fiscal year. In addition to that, the sum saved on W. P. A. and general relief for people past 60 years of age would reduce the net cost of the program to five or six or seven hundred million dollars.

Mr. President, I should like also to call to the attention of the distinguished Senators who have addressed themselves to the Senate, when they have pitifully appealed to me and the Senate not to impede the war efforts by any attempt to take care of the misery and the destitution of our elderly people, the fact that we are this very day engaged in providing a retirement system for a million or a million and a half Federal employees, who will receive sums far in excess of \$30 a month, ranging up to three or four thousand dollars a year. I do not know

whether the distinguished Senator from Kentucky realizes it, but over the next 10 or 15 or 20 years 75 or 80 percent of the money going into those pensions will be paid out of the Federal Treasury. In other words, the Senate of the United States and the Congress are entirely willing to provide a retirement system for Federal employees making good salaries, who will receive large annuities, and pay 75 or 80 percent of the sum which will be required during the next 10 or 15 years out of the Federal Treasury, but they do not believe they can lift pitiful payments of five or ten or fifteen or twenty dollars a month to \$30 a month in order to take care of elderly people.

So, Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky plead that we should not impede our war effort by increasing to \$30 the sum of \$8 or \$10 a month which the needy now receive, I inquire, how will the payment of \$30 a month to the unfortunate men and women of this Nation past 60 years of age impede the war effort? Will that make us any less strong at Manila or at Singapore or on the European Continent? How will that prevent us from producing airplanes and tanks and guns? Certainly

it will take money, but it will not take war materials, and I am firmly of the opinion that the American people want to pay the money necessary to alleviate the tremendous distress of their elderly people.

Let me ask, will the morale of a young soldier in Singapore or Europe or the Virgin Islands or Iceland be increased because his mother or father is starving to death in the United States? Will we build up a stronger nation, inspired to redeem the whole world, when we have not the Christian principle to take care of our own sickly and needy?

Of course, it will take money to do this; it will take about \$500,000,000, which is about 1 percent of the consumable wealth of this country. That means that if we would provide for the elderly people 1 percent of the consumable wealth, they then could exist in some sort of decency, and the denial of this would mean that Members of Congress living here in Washington on the fruits of the toil of our citizens are not willing for their part and for the good of the Nation to make sufficient sacrifice to give a mere subsistence, bread and butter and clothing, to our elderly citizens.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that an insecure and starving segment of the population at home is going to help us fight more bravely and effectively in the four corners of the world. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky, looking at me, proclaimed that some of us were so busy thinking about pensions that we never thought about national defense. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that every day since I have entered the Senate—and for a long time previously—I urged a dominating force for the Western Hemisphere, a two-ocean Navy, and an adequate Army; and here on the floor of the Senate almost 3 years ago I urged and importuned that we should lay in a store of strategic war materials—rubber and other commodities we now so vitally need—and for lack of which our war effort may fail.

Mr. President, I declare quite positively that we will not build a great nation if great segments of our people are left unfortunate and uncared for, and we will not win the war any sooner and will not produce any more war materials.

So, Mr. President, without further discussion, I present the amendment to the Senate for a vote unless other Senators wish to speak upon it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A good deal has been said here this afternoon about the cost of this proposal, and, of course, that is one question of fact which has developed a very wide difference of understanding. There is one phase of the matter which I have not heard discussed, that is, the income which may be applied to this proposal under the social-security law.

I have before me a copy of the hearings before the special Senate Committee on Old-Age Pensions, and I find some discussion of that subject on pages 3 and 4 of the hearings. I find that under the Federal old-age insurance system

which, of course, may be combined with the Federal aid system, there is now a tax of 2 percent, 1 percent by the employer and 1 by the employee, and that that tax is available for this old-age program.

I see this quotation, referring to a time about 8 or 10 months ahead:

On January 1, 1943, the rate will increase to 4 percent, on January 1, 1946, to 5 percent, and on January 1, 1949, to 6 percent.

It is obvious that the income which is derived from the employer's tax is ultimately collected from the general consuming public. Thus it must be understood that in the immediate present one-half of the funds being collected are from social rather than from individual contributions.

I read further:

Pay rolls of covered occupations now subject to the 2-percent tax will avail about \$40,000,000,000 in 1941—

That is, the last year—

and are rapidly expanding under the stimulus of war production. How powerful that stimulus is may be best revealed from the fact that covered wages and salaries for this year will be almost \$7,000,000,000 higher than for the last. The 2-percent pay-roll tax levied against the pay-roll base of \$40,000,000,000 will this year—

That is, last year—

yield approximately \$800,000,000, while disbursements from the insurance fund in 1941 will approximate only about \$100,000,000.

There is an excess shown from the receipts above disbursements in the year 1941 of \$700,000,000.

I continue to read:

Because of this yearly excess of revenue over disbursements the reserve fund of the insurance system is steadily increasing. On July 1, 1941, it had amounted—

Speaking of the excess—

To \$2,400,000,000, and is expected to rise to \$3,100,000,000 by July 1, 1942.

Of course, it is evident since this statement was made, based upon a pay roll of \$40,000,000,000, that the total pay roll may double during this year, but certainly if it has not already done so, it has increased to \$65,000,000,000, or \$70,000,000,000, on which this year 2 percent will apply. Let us say the pay roll goes to \$75,000,000,000; then there will be \$1,500,000,000 income from the total pay roll.

By the 1st of January next probably, at the rate that business is now increasing and Government funds are being expended, we shall have a pay roll of, say, \$80,000,000,000, and, with 4 percent applied to it, \$3,200,000,000 would be available for this program next year. I have not heard any mention of the income that is available under present laws, without any additional taxes being levied. Business is increasing, and the rate of taxation is also increasing. I submit there is no sound reason for the reduction of the program dealt with by the amendment of the Senator from California based on the fear that it will call upon the taxpayers for additional taxes. They must pay the taxes whether persons of old age get any of them or not.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am deeply appreciative of the comments made by the Sena-

tor from Alabama, and I am wholly in agreement with him.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word further. If there is any error in my figures—and I am positive there is not—the error can be discovered after the bill is passed, when it goes to conference, and there will be full opportunity for the Senate, undoubtedly, and for the House of Representatives to discover any error I may have made, or that my distinguished opponents may have made. Consequently, with that statement I shall conclude my argument, and I am ready for a vote. The only thing I should like to add is that I should like a record vote when we are ready to vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say for the record that Arkansas and South Carolina will probably be the main benefactors, insofar as Federal pensions or old-age benefits are concerned. I agree with other Senators who have spoken that it is necessary to help the older people. In this hour of need and trial and tribulation, I am very happy to have been here and to have heard the addresses made on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators. We should all be united and should do nothing to create fear or any unfavorable publicity, so much of which we have had during the past month. So I shall vote against the amendment, although I know that South Carolina, next to Arkansas, would be the main benefactor under its provisions. I shall do so because I believe we should take no action which might tend to bring about fear or division.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I had intended to speak earlier on the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] when I believed it had a more favorable chance of passage than I believe it has at the present time. I did not vote for the measure providing for congressional pensions. I did vote for its repeal. I feel that some good has been accomplished by reason of the fact that the congressional pensions were voted about a month ago because it appears to me to have provided a vehicle which otherwise was lacking for getting the old-age pension proposal onto the floor of the Senate.

I have been here since the 3d of last August, and I know that many good old-age-pension bills are pending, but for some reason or other the Senate has been too busy to give consideration to any old-age-pension proposals, and I believe the country at large, especially the folks in my State, had almost become convinced that the Congress was not pension minded, but all of a sudden, out of a clear sky, the people all over America discovered that the Congress was very much pension minded when they learned that Congress had passed a measure providing pensions for its Members. So this action opened up the whole question of pensions and enabled the old-age-pension problem to get onto the floor of the Senate for discussion.

Mr. President, I have had some experience in connection with pension matters as Governor of the State of Texas.

We have had quite a discussion for several years in Texas with reference to old-age pensions. The majority of the people there found that the candidates who spoke the loudest in favor of old-age pensions were familiar with the rules and used all their influence in the senate and house of representatives after they were elected to keep the old-age pensions from being paid. The citizens of Texas, by an overwhelming majority, had previously written into the Constitution of the State of Texas a provision for the payment of old-age pensions, but the fulfillment of that pledge to its fullest degree possible was prevented for a long time by some very tricky politicians, who found ways and means of keeping the Legislature of the State of Texas from providing the funds with which to pay the pensions. We finally did get a tax bill enacted, however, which provides \$21,000,000 State money annually for old-age pensions, but we did not get this tax bill passed until after the sovereign voters of Texas sent 104 new faces to the legislature out of a total membership of 181.

I would not say that there is any insincerity here in the United States Senate, because it is not my province to make any charge like that, but we shall possibly learn from the people back home just what they think. We shall also learn what they think when the amendment of the Senator from California is finally defeated today, as I predict it will be defeated, whereas I believe it would have passed if it had come up while the Congress had its tail in the crack [laughter], and I think everyone admits that Congress was in a very bad position.

But this is a serious matter, and I am very sincere in my intention to try to contribute something to alleviate the suffering that is going on in the State of Texas and in other States because of the high cost of living and the low pensions that are being paid to these old folks.

I think we should look at this matter in a practical manner. From the discussions that have been going on on the floor of the Senate today one would gather the impression that the subject for discussion is whether or not the Congress of the United States should adopt a social-security program, when we all know that is not the case. The social-security program has already been adopted. It was adopted several years ago, and I think it meets with the favor of the vast majority of the citizens of the United States. All that is up for discussion now is the amendment of the Senator from California, to provide increased pensions to the old folks of the United States and to straighten out some of the inequalities that exist in our present pension plan. I believe it is unequal and unfair for the Federal Government to pay different sums of money to old folks who are in identical financial condition simply because they happen to live in different States.

That is the way our present social-security and old-age pension plan is working out. Someone living in one State will receive more Federal pension money than a person in another State, although he is in exactly the same financial condition.

As I understand it, the Downey amendment would help to straighten out that situation and cause a more equitable distribution of funds to citizens of the United States, regardless of the State in which they may reside.

Mr. President, we are not considering the adoption of a social-security plan. We are considering paying more Federal pensions to the old people in the United States. It seems to me that we should consider whether or not larger payments are necessary. We all know that the cost of living has risen rapidly and that it costs much more to buy food, clothing, and medicine, which are the really essential things of life, than it did a few months ago but the pensions of the old people have not been increased. On top of that we all know that many of the sons of the old folks have been drafted or have volunteered and are now in the armed services of the United States; and the old folks do not have any source of revenue coming from the boys and men who are now in the Army.

We also know that there are many old folks on farms, that their boys have gone into the Army, and that they will not be able to employ outside labor at the high rates now being paid. Therefore they will not be able to make a living on the farm. If their age justifies, they will come under the social security benefits. More money will be required to meet that situation. So, in my opinion, this is only a question of raising enough money to provide food, shelter, clothing, and medicine for the old folks who are in dire need of those necessities of life.

We have heard some wonderful arguments today about the terrible war condition which exists. We are all familiar with that condition. We have heard that we must economize. We all know that, and we all want to do it. We are all willing and anxious to do everything we can to economize and help pay the enormous cost of this war. No doubt many persons throughout the United States wonder about the sincerity of those who talk about economizing by paying less pensions, or at least not increasing the pensions to the old folks, while at the same time the Congress of the United States sits idly by and permits labor union leader racketeers to extort high fees from the good, honest, patriotic workmen of America before they can even work on a defense job. We have no way of knowing, of course, how much this racket amounts to; but it is variously estimated to amount to between \$500,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000 a year, which the union-leader racketeers are forcing good honest laboring men to pay before they can work on Government defense jobs. Of course, that money is part of the cost of the Federal projects and comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. If we are sincere in wanting to economize, why do we sit idly by and permit something like that to go on? Why do we not stop it?

Furthermore, it has been proved by a committee of the Senate that exorbitant profits have been made by contractors who are building defense projects for the United States Government. Some of the profits were so large that those who

took the money became conscience stricken and tried to give the money back. We know that there are only a very few in that class. Many others are making exorbitant profits out of defense contracts. What is being done to stop that racket and cut down that enormous and useless expense? We all know that much war profiteering is going on at the present time. What is being done about trying to recover the money which is being extorted by war profiteers?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Let me say for the information of the Senator that for several weeks the Committee on Naval Affairs has been giving that matter a great deal of attention and study, and proposes to offer some amendments seeking to limit and restrict all profits.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the able Senator from Massachusetts. I know that the people are heartened by the efforts which are being put forth. Likewise, the people were heartened by the statement from the President of the United States that there would be no war profiteering during this war. Nevertheless, we know that it is going on. It seems to me that if we want to bring about unity among the people of the United States we should be sincere in our efforts, and instead of trying to economize a little by taking food out of the mouths of people who are actually starving and suffering we should commence to economize in some of the useless expenditures of the Government's money.

I hope that every Senator will give serious consideration to the amendment which is pending before the Senate. It is a matter which should receive serious consideration. It would straighten out some of the inequalities of our present old-age pension system. It would perhaps require a little more money; but what is to be gained by our aged citizens if we win this war and those who are giving up their sons to help win the war die of starvation before the war is won?

I know that we are put to great expense on account of this war, and I know that our people are suffering throughout the entire Nation under the burden of heavy taxation. But we are in this war and must and will see it through. I repeat that I think we should commence to economize in other places before we take food out of the mouths of the old folks of this Nation who have no other means of support. Many of our old folks are entirely destitute. Many of them have no income whatever. Some of them have been receiving a little help from their children. Their sons are now gone, and are unable to help them any more.

Taking all those things into consideration, I think this is a matter which deserves the serious attention of the Senate at this particular time. It is an important matter which should not be side-tracked. There should be no pussyfooting, but we should face the issue and try to treat fairly the old folks who have been responsible for helping to build the greatest Nation the world has ever known. They have made their contribution to making the great United States

of America what it is, and possibly through no fault of their own they find themselves, as they face the setting sun, in destitute circumstances. The cost of their living has risen. I think we should vote to pay more money to our old folks, and not look upon it as a new social-security program which is being adopted, because that is not the case. The vast majority of the people of the United States are in favor of social security, and they are in favor of handling it on a fair and equitable basis. So I hope Senators will give this matter full consideration and vote for the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have spent some time in preparing an address on this question. For 7 years I have had before the Finance Committee a bill or an amendment to change the miserable and criminal matching law which is now in operation. I hail from a State which is not economically able to match Federal money in order to provide decent compensation for our old citizens who are in need. Mississippi has been able to match only in a limited way. The average pension has been \$4, \$5, \$6, or \$7. I believe it has now reached \$8 or \$10.

I feel very keenly the necessity of this legislation. I appreciate the fact that it would cost additional money. When we relieve the W. P. A. and other relief agencies of those who would participate in the distribution under the pending amendment, the amount would not be so large as some of our friends seem to think it would be. It would be the best investment that could be made. I think it is really a defense and an emergency proposition. It will contribute a great deal to the morale of the citizenship and the home life of America, because, if I am a prophet, this war will last from 5 to 10 years, and perhaps longer. It will take 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 boys to win it, and there will not be left at home many folks who will be prepared to take care of the old people who need this aid from the Government.

Oh, it may be said that a man should make his own living, but we must remember that in industry and in almost any work job 'n America today a man who reaches 60 years of age is no longer needed. He is no longer employed. He is ostracized. He is left out of the picture. As he reaches a more advanced age the burden of life becomes heavier. I think if there is any legislation that has been before Congress which deserves serious consideration and merits passage, it is the measure submitted by our friend the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNER].

No doubt some of the newspapers and some Senators who are thinking about voting against this proposal want to associate the name Townsend with it. This is not a Townsend measure. It is a straight-out plan for giving \$30 a month to the needy of the country who are over the age of 60, and it has no relationship whatsoever to the Townsend plan or the Townsend scheme, or the Townsend theory. It is a straight-out plan to take care of the worthy needy citizens of our Republic.

Coming from one of the States that needs such aid for its elderly people—I represent a poor State, possibly made poor by economic conditions for which the Congress itself is responsible—I am very happy to know that my friend, the junior Senator from California, is advocating a Nation-wide pension of \$30 a month, instead of calling upon the impoverished States to match the Federal contributions in order that their needy elderly citizens may receive a decent compensation, a decent pension.

Today some States are paying their old people \$40 a month, \$20 of which is coming from the Treasury of the Federal Government. That in itself would be considered by the old people of Mississippi as a wonderful pension. But the obligation is a Federal obligation, and should be so met. Being a Federal obligation, every citizen of the Republic, regardless of State lines, should share equally in whatever money is appropriated out of Federal funds in order to take care of needy citizens, all of whom live under the same flag.

Some persons are inclined to want to do away with State lines anyway, and this is one time when I am willing to go along with them and to vote to do away with State lines in voting \$30 a month to the needy old people of the Republic.

Whether the measure passes today is not the question. We should keep up this fight until the Congress is made to see that the responsibility is a Federal responsibility which should be met. Thirty dollars a month is not too much; it is not enough.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Mississippi has just said with respect to poor and weak States, I desire to call attention very briefly to a bill which I have pending, Senate bill 1946, relating to the subject of the amendment of the Social Security Act and old-age pensions. The bill has been approved by the Social Security Board, and I think it will be approved by the administration. It seeks to meet the situation referred to by the Senator from Mississippi, in that it graduates the contribution according to the financial ability of the States, and in the very poorest States it provides for a Federal contribution of as much as 75 percent, as against a contribution of 25 percent by the State. The measure is pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and I simply refer to it at this time and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1946) to amend the Social Security Act by providing for special Federal aid to certain States, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title XI the following:

"Sec. 1108. (a) Effective with respect to the quarter beginning January 1, 1942, and each quarter thereafter, each State, except the State whose per capita income is greatest, shall have special Federal aid included in grants for each program of the State for quarters it may be entitled to a normal Federal share for such program.

"(b) Subject to subsection (e), the sum of the special Federal aid and the normal Federal share for a quarter—

"(1) For each program of the State whose per capita income is smallest, shall be equal to three-fourths of expenditures under such program.

"(2) For each program of all other States entitled to special Federal aid, shall be equal to intermediate fractions between one-half and three-fourths of expenditures under such program.

"The amount of special Federal aid for each program shall be determined under subsection (d).

"(c) The per capita income of each State shall be determined by the Social Security Board between July 1 and December 31 of each even-numbered year for the most recent period of 3 consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such determination shall for purposes of this section be conclusive as to per capita income for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning on the July 1 next succeeding such determination: *Provided*, That the Board shall make such a determination of per capita incomes as soon as possible after the enactment of this act, to be conclusive for the purposes of this section for each of the six quarters in the period beginning January 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1943.

"(d) For any State program the special Federal aid for a quarter shall be the amount bearing the same ratio to one-half the normal Federal share for such program for such quarter that the difference in amount between the per capita income of such State and the largest per capita income determined under subsection (c) bears to the difference in amount between the smallest and largest per capita incomes so determined.

"(e) (1) For any quarter where one-half of the total of expenditures under a program of a State does not exceed one-half of the average quarterly expenditures of such State under such program for 1940, such State shall not receive any special Federal aid for such program.

"(2) For any quarter where one-half of the total of expenditures under a program of a State exceeds one-half of the average quarterly expenditures of such State under such program for 1940, but such excess is less than the special Federal aid for such program of such State as computed under subsection (d), such special Federal aid shall be reduced to the amount of such excess.

"(f) Any special Federal aid to which a State may be entitled for a program under this section, for purposes of subsection (b) of section 3, 403, or 1003, as the case may be, shall be added to and be considered a part of the amount payable under subsection (a) of such section.

"(g) When used in this section—

"(1) The term 'program' means an approved State plan with respect to which the State is entitled to payments under section 3, section 403, or section 1003 of this act.

"(2) The term 'expenditures' includes only expenditures with respect to which a State is entitled to receive Federal payments as determined under a section enumerated in clause (1) of this subsection.

"(3) The term 'normal Federal share' means the amount payable under a section enumerated in clause (1) of this subsection without increase by special Federal aid.

"(4) The term 'State' shall not include Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term 'average quarterly expenditures' means one-fourth of the total of expenditures for a year under a program of a State, not including expenditures for the costs of administration of such program."

SEC. 2. Effective with respect to each quarter commencing after the date of enactment of this act—

(a) Clause (2) of section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 303), is hereby amended to read as follows: "(2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Board for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose."

(b) Clause (1) (A) of section 3 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 303), clause (1) (A) of section 403 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 603), and clause (1) (A) of section 1003 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 1203), are each hereby amended to read as follows: "(A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if the sum of such amount and the estimated Federal grant to be paid the State, including any special Federal aid available under section 1108, is less than the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived."

(c) Section 3 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 303), is hereby amended by deleting from clauses (1) and (2) thereof the words "clause (1) of" wherever they appear.

(d) Clause (3) of section 3 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 303), is hereby amended by deleting "increased by 5 per centum."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield in a moment. First, I desire to say that when the Senate Finance Committee takes up the whole pension situation, including the other bills which have been submitted on the subject, I shall press for consideration of my bill.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana, to whom I have already promised to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas what is the scale of payments provided in his bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. From 50 percent to 75 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have a similar bill pending, S. 161, and I had it referred to the Senate Finance Committee. I received a copy of a report addressed to the Finance Committee from the Federal Security Agency, turning it down.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what the Senator's bill provides.

Mr. ELLENDER. It provides for the payment of three-fourths of old-age assistance by the Federal Government of a total payment of \$30, and any payments in excess of \$30 and not exceeding \$45, on a 50-50 basis. In other words, for every dollar advanced by the State, the Federal Government would put up \$3, so that any State that would furnish as much as \$7.50, the Federal Government would contribute \$22.50, thereby assuring \$30 pensions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I can say that my bill has been approved by formal testi-

mony taken at hearings at which the Social Security Board approved it, and they aided in drafting it. At the time when the Finance Committee takes up the whole subject matter and gives it consideration in the normal way, and after the report on the measure to the Senate, the bill will be considered, and I propose to push it before the committee when it has been scientifically studied by the Social Security Board.

Mr. ELLENDER. I find it strange that the Board should report adversely to my bill, S. 161, which, in part, provides as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1941, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who at the time of such expenditure is 65 years of age or older and is not an inmate of a public institution:

(A) Three-fourths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$30, plus

(B) One-half of so much of such expenditures with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$30, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$45.

And should report favorably on the Senator's bill.

With the permission of the Senator from Texas, let me further point out that in order to comply with the criticism of the Federal Security Agency to my bill, S. 161, I sent its report to Mr. Rice, assistant counsel of the Senate Legislative Counsel, and I suggested to him that he draft a bill that would meet all of the objections of the administrator. I first suggested to Mr. Rice that a minimum Federal payment of \$20 be made by the Federal Government, and I afterward changed the amount to \$15 in the hope that I could obtain sufficient support for the new bill I was about to introduce.

Mr. Rice prepared a bill, and on May 10, 1941, he wrote me, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1941.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: The enclosed draft of a bill "to amend the Social Security Act with respect to Federal grants to States for old-age assistance" will meet the objections of the Federal Security Administrator, but not those of the Treasury Department, since the Treasury, I assume, would object at this time to any amendment to the act that would increase the Federal share.

In brief, the bill provides that the Federal Government will contribute (1) one-half of the administrative expenses incurred by each State in connection with old-age assistance; (2) one-half of the expenditures for old-age assistance up to \$40 per month per individual; and (3) a minimum payment in an amount equal to the product of \$15 multiplied by the total number of payments for old-age assistance during the quarter, in the case of any State that pays from State sources an individual average monthly amount not less than the individual average monthly amount paid from the State sources during the first 6

months of 1941. So that in low-income States that keep their contributions from State sources equal to the average paid during the first 6 months of this year, a minimum Federal payment will be made. This provision will result in a larger Federal payment being made to those States whose average payments for old-age assistance is less than \$30.

Very truly yours,

S. E. RICE,
Assistant Counsel.

Mr. President, on July 3, 1941, I introduced the bill prepared by Mr. Rice, which, as he wrote me, conformed to the suggestions of the Social Security Agency, and the bill became S. 1715 and was referred to the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

On January 22, 1942, the Social Security Agency Administrator submitted his report on S. 1715 to the Finance Committee of the Senate. The report, I would say, is not very favorable or very encouraging.

Mr. President, there has been much talk of helping the aged of our Nation, but very little action taken. I am convinced that it is the duty of the Federal Government to provide for the bulk of old-age assistance. Today the excuse for inaction is the war. Tomorrow it will be the billions of dollars that we will owe because of the war.

Let us take care of the elderly people now by providing a meager amount for their sustenance. I have been humbly battling for them since 1937, when I first entered the Senate, but I have been unable to make much progress because of the adverse position taken by the Federal Security Agency.

I agree that our paramount duty is to win the war. That can and will be done. Let us bring contentment to the aged of our Nation; the fathers and mothers and grandparents of some of those who are now in our armed service, and by so doing, it will, in my humble judgment, bolster the courage of those who are engaged in making the supreme sacrifice so that America may live.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, S. 1715, together with the report of the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

There being no objection, the bill and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing January 1, 1942, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who at the time of such expenditure is 65 years of age or older and is not an inmate of a public institution, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$40: Provided, That if, in any State, the individual average monthly amount paid in any quarter from State sources as old-age assistance to individuals receiving such assistance in such State is not less than the individual average monthly amount paid from

State sources as old-age assistance to individuals receiving such assistance in such State during the first 6 months of 1941, the minimum amount to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State for such quarter shall be an amount equal to the product of \$15 multiplied by the total number of payments for old-age assistance during such quarter, not counting more than one payment per individual with respect to any month in such quarter; and (2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Board for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose. As used in this subsection, the term 'individual average monthly amount' with respect to any month in any quarter means an amount equal to one-third of the amount paid from State sources as old-age assistance during such quarter divided by the number of individuals receiving such assistance during such month, and the term 'State sources' means sources other than Federal."

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 3 is amended by striking out, in the third line thereof, "clause (1) of"; by striking out, in the sixth line thereof, the word "clause" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "subsection"; and by striking out, in the ninth line thereof, the word "one-half" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the State's share."

(b) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by striking out, in the fifth and sixth lines thereof, "clause (1) of."

(c) Paragraph (3) of such subsection is amended by striking out "increased by 5 percent."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on January 1, 1942.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, January 22, 1942.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of July 7, 1941, requesting a report of this Agency relative to S. 1715, a bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to Federal grants to States for old-age assistance.

This bill proposes to continue the present dollar-for-dollar matching basis for old-age assistance up to maximum payments of \$40 per month under title I of the Social Security Act, but to provide minimum Federal contributions of \$15 per month per recipient so long as average payments in a State are not decreased below the average for the first 6 months of 1941.

It is clearly the purpose of this bill to provide more adequate old-age assistance for the Nation's needy aged. It might be argued that the proposal would go far in accomplishing this purpose if it is assumed (1) that every State during the first 6 months of 1941 provided for its needy aged to the extent of its ability; (2) that the funds available in each State for this purpose were so distributed as to reach all the needy aged of the State on an equitable basis; and (3) that no fluctuation is to be anticipated in the economic capacities of the several States subsequent to the first 6 months of 1941. As it is seriously doubted that these assumptions could be reasonably made, it is feared that S. 1715 would not lead to the desired adequacy in old-age assistance.

Perhaps failure of the proposal may be most readily anticipated in those States which average relatively high monthly payments to recipients of old-age assistance but do so through the maintenance of long waiting lists. These States have chosen to provide what may be regarded as reasonably adequate assistance to a given number of recipients while providing nothing for other needy aged who are eligible to become recipients but are car-

ried on extensive waiting lists. It will be readily appreciated that the special assistance proposed by S. 1715 would accomplish relatively little in such States, for no aid would be provided in meeting the need for extending aid to more people which exceeds, in such cases, that for extending more aid to those already on the assistance rolls.

In certain States available funds have been distributed on a broader basis so that the waiting lists are relatively short but monthly payments are correspondingly low. These States would receive disproportionate aid under S. 1715 and would be in a position to increase or decrease the numbers of their recipients while continuing to maintain an average payment which would place the assistance load of the State largely on the Federal Government. There would be no incentive for such States to assume a larger share of the load.

It is my feeling that the Federal Government should, as nearly as is reasonably possible, take steps to enable the States to provide more adequately for their needy aged. However, in my opinion, any such provision of special Federal aid should be directly related to the respective economic capacities of the several States, and should be such as to enable the States to meet their local problems in accordance with local situations and without any stimulus from the Federal Government to increase or decrease their case loads or to vary the amounts of their average monthly payments.

S. 1715 would also provide for grants to States for old-age assistance administrative expenses on a dollar for dollar matching basis in lieu of the present 5 percent of the assistance grant. I agree that this change in the grant for administration should be made.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of S. 1715 in its present form would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. McNUTT,
Administrator.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his kind indulgence.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. What is the maximum pension to be provided under the bill of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is the same as under the present law: The Federal Government pays \$20, and the State can give what it pleases.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator's bill is based on a \$20 payment?

Mr. CONNALLY. The maximum is \$20.

Mr. BILBO. What are the prospects of getting the Senator's bill out of the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think its prospects of getting out of the committee are better than those of any other pending bill, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Can we hope for results at this session?

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope we shall get action on it, but I cannot speak for the committee. However, I think my bill has prospects more favorable than those of any bill now pending—not because the Senator from Texas is asking for it, but because it is approved by the Social Security Board.

Mr. BILBO. I hope the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. Downey] may be agreed to; but if it should fail of adoption, I am glad the measure offered by the Senator from Texas furnishes some ray of hope.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have very carefully studied the bill which has been offered by my worthy colleague, the senior Senator from Texas. I wholeheartedly approve of his bill, and am hopeful that we shall have an opportunity to vote on it, because I think it covers the subject thoroughly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'DANIEL. However, I expressed myself today as in favor of the Downey amendment, because it is the first old-age pension proposal which has come before the Senate for attention. Nevertheless, I certainly want to make it plain that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill of the Senator from Texas, and I hope we shall have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank my colleague. I desired to have my bill printed in the Record at this time because it meets so vividly the situation presented by the Senator who has just spoken.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending, and I fear that in the confusion following the vote it may not be understood.

Briefly, it comprises the contents of a bill which has already passed the Senate and is now pending in the House. It involves, I think, a matter which is more important than anything we have discussed in the last week. That is the security of the flow of iron ore from the Lake Superior area to the mills at the foot of Lake Erie—in Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and other places. It involves the safety of 85,000,000 tons of iron ore.

The situation at Sault Ste. Marie, where the locks which connect Lakes Superior and Huron are located, is such that one accurately placed bomb would destroy the Great Lakes transportation system. By the \$8,000,000 expenditure which the bill provides, a lock can be constructed at some distance from the existing locks, so as to assure additional security. Various agencies of the Government, including the Office of Production Management, the War Department, the President's Advisory Council, are anxious that the bill pass. I have the assent of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs that it may be adopted as an amendment to the pending bill, and I hope in this way we can get some action on this necessary measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Michigan has offered this amendment because it is for a very vitally necessary emergency need, namely, to protect the iron supply—which means the steel supply—of the United States.

In passing, I simply wish to comment on what I regard as a perfectly disgraceful effort to cram down a number of "pork barrel" provisions in the pending

river and harbor bill by holding back and including in it such a meritorious proposal as that for the Soo Canal.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Time To Ration Pork," having reference to the pending river and harbor bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

TIME TO RATION PORK

President Roosevelt has sent a letter to Chairman Mansfield of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee asking for prompt action on bill H. R. 5993. This bill, to use the President's words, authorizes "certain waterway improvements for navigation and power production." These projects, Mr. Roosevelt says, though without mentioning their names, are "urgently needed on account of the war emergency."

And what are the projects "urgently needed on account of the war emergency," which bill H. R. 5993 would authorize? There is not space, of course, to list the more than 200 items which are included, but here are some of them: The Florida ship canal; the St. Lawrence seaway; the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway; the canalization of the Coosa River in Alabama; the canalization of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers in Ohio and Pennsylvania; the canalization of the Neches, Angelina, and Trinity Rivers in Texas.

In other words, about the only controversial waterways project proposed since the advent of the New Deal not blanketed into this omnibus measure is old Quoddy—the scheme for harnessing the tides on the Maine coast, which was abandoned in the face of national ridicule after large sums had been squandered on it.

How much money would be required to carry out these "urgent" war projects no one can possibly know. The New York Herald Tribune says that the "initial costs are estimated conservatively at a billion dollars."

To describe this as a pork-barrel bill is to be more than generous to it. The fact is that it is exceedingly worse than the average peacetime "pork barrel" measure. This is wartime, with the Nation confronting the darkest future in its history. Every cent which can be had is needed to prosecute the war and to save our form of government and our way of life. Yet the President has come out in favor of a blanket bill authorizing 200 waterways projects, including the Florida ship canal.

Whatever the merits of the St. Lawrence seaway, and a good case can be made for its construction, this is a most dubious time for undertaking it. Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada said a year ago that the case for the project should be reexamined "from the point of view of public need and in the light of war requirements."

In any event, the St. Lawrence seaway should stand on its own merits. If it is to be approved in Congress, it should be approved because it is favored for what it is, not because it was thrown into an omnibus pork bill, designed to gather in the votes of Members of Congress from Texas, Ohio, Alabama, and everywhere else.

When the country heard about the St. Lawrence seaway back in 1934, it was presented in the form of a proposed treaty between the United States and Canada. As a treaty, it required a two-thirds majority. A year ago it was reduced to an "international agreement." Now it has lost all such dignity and becomes merely an item in a pork-barrel bill requiring a simple majority—a majority which won't be needed at all if the bill can

be put on the unanimous consent calendar and passed without a roll-call vote.

Can it be that the administration and Congress have learned absolutely nothing from the national protest against the self-serving pension law and the strange way in which it was put over? Many Members are now quaking in their boots before the storm raised among their constituents by that blunder. They are calling for repeal. Can they not see that H. R. 5993 is charged with the same kind of dynamite?

A committee amendment would limit subsequent appropriations to projects "certified by some authorized national defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary in the interest of national defense." Well and good, but why then obtain authorization now for some 200 projects, many of which cannot stand the national defense test in the light of more pressing needs? Is it because authorization is an important step and this is an easy way to get it over with?

The American people are rationing sugar in their homes.

It is time to begin rationing pork in Washington.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask that the report which I filed in behalf of the Commerce Committee be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that the amendment may be fully understood.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (No. 956) submitted by Mr. BROWN on January 15, 1942, is as follows:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2132) authorizing the construction of a new lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Mich., in the interest of national defense, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of War to construct an additional lock in the St. Marys Falls Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. Full and detailed information is contained in Document No. 218 of the House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, included in which is the letter from the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

St. Marys River is 63 miles long and flows southeasterly from Lake Superior to Lake Huron. The locks at Sault Ste. Marie provide navigation to accommodate all vessels passing from Lake Superior to Lake Huron and thereby all of the other of the Great Lakes, including the passage through the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic Ocean. There are four parallel locks on the United States side of the falls and one lock on the Canadian side. Two of the four American locks are of sufficient depth to accommodate the largest lake steamers. In 1940 of a total tonnage of 89,000,000 tons, 87,000,000 were carried through the two large locks and only approximately 2,000,000 tons through the Poe lock on the American side and the Canadian lock on the other side of the falls. The Weitzel lock, which is very shallow, is practically unserviceable.

This bill will provide for a new lock on the site of the Weitzel lock.

All of the shipping interests on the Great Lakes are in favor of the construction of the new lock. This bill was introduced at the request of the Office of Production Management, with the approval of the War Department, as an emergency war measure. It undoubtedly is needed at all times, but its need at the present is the paramount consideration. Without it there are only two locks capable of carrying vessels of a draft greater than 16.6 feet. Vessels could take greater loads than they now take if a 30-foot depth is obtained as is proposed in the War Department plans.

Approximately 90 percent of American ore comes from the Lake Superior region and the great bulk of this ore moves by boat through the Sault Canal. The traffic through this canal is the greatest of any canal in the world. In normal times it exceeds the combined traffic in total tonnage of the Panama, Suez, and Kell Canals. Now it is very much greater. Our steel and iron production is dependent upon the maintenance of these locks, the most important single artery in our defense production. Through this canal and these locks flows in raw state every battleship, every cruiser, every submarine, every great cannon, and every infantryman's rifle. The airplanes, the shells, the tanks, in short our whole combat power is dependent on sure and certain transportation through this most vital of all arteries. Duluth-Superior Harbor is the largest export shipping point in the world. All of this traffic goes through the canal. In addition to this traffic, ore is shipped in large quantities from two Harbors in Minnesota, Ashland, Wis., and Marquette, Mich., through the Sault Canal.

Rail transportation is available to carry ore from the iron ranges to Lake Superior, but rail companies do not have cars in sufficient quantity to carry ore on a 1,000-mile journey from the head of Lake Superior to the Lake Erie ports, where most of it is discharged. Immense vessels carrying from two to three hundred cars of ore each trip are the sole available carriers of ore for the steel mills in the Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan and Chicago steel-producing areas. Rail transportation cannot meet the demand. In 1941, 80,000,000 gross tons of iron ore were carried through the locks, being all the Lake Superior area ore except for a comparatively small amount carried from Escanaba, Mich., to Gary, Ind. This is practically all of the iron ore produced in the United States. It is expected that close to 90,000,000 tons will be carried in 1942 and a similar amount in 1943. These amounts probably exceed the capacity of the present locks. In 1941 the collapse of a rail bridge blocked this channel for 4 days and cut the total tonnage carried by approximately 500,000 gross tons. It is the opinion of all concerned, the Office of Production Management, and the War Department, as well as the shippers and consumers of ore that this additional lock is essential to our war effort.

In addition to ore, there is a very heavy grain movement from the Northwest through the harbors at the head of Lake Superior to Buffalo and other lower lake points and the St. Lawrence River. The principal commodities other than ore and grain are coal, lumber, oil, and stone. There is a substantial passenger traffic in addition.

It is anticipated that if this bill is promptly enacted, that the lock can be completed for use at the time when the defense effort reaches its peak. The cost is estimated at \$8,000,000. Funds heretofore voted may be, and it is planned will be, used for the construction of this aid to navigation. Prompt enactment of the bill is urged by the Government departments concerned. The bill has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget as indicated by the attached letters.

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, January 15, 1942.

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Reference is made to your letter of December 18, 1941, requesting the views of this Department regarding Senate bill No. 2132, authorizing the construction of a new lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Mich., in the interest of national defense.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the construction of a new lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Mich., to replace the present unserviceable Weitzel lock, in accordance with the

recommendations of this Department in a report recently submitted to Congress and printed as House Document No. 218, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. The need for such new lock, and the reasons for this Department's recommending its construction at this time are set forth in detail in that document, a copy of which is enclosed for convenient reference. The estimated cost as given in the document is \$8,000,000 for new work and \$100,000 annually for maintenance and operation.

Construction of a new lock at this place has been recommended by the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, as evidenced by copies herewith of letters from Commissioner Budd to the Secretary of War and to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, together with the resolution adopted by the Advisory Commission. It is also recommended by the Office of Production Management, as indicated by copy of letter from Hon. William S. Knudsen to the Acting Secretary of War.

Early completion of the new lock is desirable to facilitate the transportation of commodities required by the national defense program. Prompt and favorable consideration of the bill by Congress is therefore recommended.

This report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, which advised that there would be no objection to its submission to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 26, 1941.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: On December 18, 1941, you referred to me S. 2132, a bill authorizing the construction of a new lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Mich., in the interest of national defense, and requested me to furnish the Senate Committee on Commerce with the views of the Office for Emergency Management with respect to the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage.

I am advised by the Transportation Division of the Office for Emergency Management that the construction of the lock authorized by S. 2132 would greatly contribute to the transportation of iron ore required for the war effort, and that present facilities of the St. Marys Falls Canal are clearly inadequate. Existing lock facilities which have sufficient capacity to handle the larger type of ore are so situated that a single obstruction could block all traffic through them. As a matter of fact, just such an occurrence took place this past fall, when about 1,000,000 tons of ore were lost for the winter due to an accident to a bridge at these locks.

In view of these circumstances, the Office for Emergency Management strongly favors the enactment of S. 2132.

Very sincerely yours,

WAYNE COY,
Liaison Officer for Emergency Management.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1942.
The Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We are informed that there has been referred to your committee a bill that will authorize the Secretary of War to construct an additional lock in the St. Marys Falls Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

In 1941 about 80,000,000 gross tons of iron ore, 85 percent of all the iron ore mined in

the United States, was locked around the falls of the St. Marys River from Lake Superior, in addition to large quantities of coal, grain, limestone, and other commodities. The importance of this waterway in the war economy cannot be exaggerated.

As new blast furnaces come into production, the demand for Lake Superior iron ore is expected to increase to 88,000,000 gross tons in 1942 and to 90,000,000 gross tons in 1943, probably exceeding the capacity of the present locks.

Mishaps, even minor ones, to the locks seriously impede the passage of vessels. For example, in 1941 the collapse of a bridge partly blocked the channel for 4 days, blocking the movement of 500,000 gross tons of iron ore. Another deep-draft lock is needed to increase total lock capacity and prevent loss of tonnage in case of accident or break-down to one or more of the locks during the navigation season.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN,
Director General.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if I may have the yeas and nays on my amendment by consent, without the calling of a quorum, I shall be glad to have that done. Otherwise, I should like to have a quorum call.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I represent a State which would benefit more from the adoption of this amendment than would any other State in the Union; but in the interest of sound government, believing that we should make every possible war effort, I shall vote "nay" on the amendment. I feel sure that the people of my State, the vast majority of whom are conservative people, including the elderly people, will fully approve my vote, as they are much more interested in winning the war than they are in the matter of pensions at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My colleague [Mr. HATCH] is absent because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has been called to the State of Pennsylvania on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is also absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] has a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. My colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent in a hospital because of a hip injury. If present, he would vote "nay." He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is detained at his home by illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—22

Bankhead	Ellender	Nye
Billbo	Harden	O'Daniel
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Bulow	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Bunker	La Follette	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Lee	Wheeler
Downey	McFarland	
Doxey	Murray	

NAYS—49

Austin	Gillette	Norris
Bailey	Glass	O'Mahoney
Ball	Green	Overton
Barkley	Gurney	Radcliffe
Brewster	Herring	Spencer
Brown	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Butler	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	
Gerry	Murdoch	

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Langer	Snethers
Andrews	Lodge	Smith
Barbour	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Pepper	Tunnell
Brooks	Reed	Wagner
Chandler	Reynolds	Wiley
Davis	Rosier	Willis
Guffey	Russell	
Hatch	Shipstead	

So Mr. DOWNEY's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment I have offered, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment, as amended, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 16. The existing project for the Great Lakes and connecting channels is modified to provide for a new lock about 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet deep, at St.

Marys Falls Canal, Mich., together with suitable approaches thereto, said lock to replace the present Weitzel lock and approaches, all in accordance with the recommendations contained in House Document No. 218, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

This improvement is hereby adopted and authorized and shall be prosecuted in the interest of national defense under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Mr. WALSH. Am I to understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan relates to a very urgent national defense project?

Mr. BROWN. It does.

Mr. WALSH. And that the project has been passed upon favorably by the Senate heretofore?

Mr. BROWN. It has been.

Mr. WALSH. Has there been some difficulty in getting a vote on the project in the House?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And attaching the provision to the pending bill it will compel some action on the project in the House, pro or con?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. Let me say to the Senator that I feel that the amendment may very logically be attached to the pending bill, because every battleship, every submarine, every cruiser which the Navy builds, passes, in the raw state, through this canal at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. WALSH. In view of that information I have no objection to the amendment, and, so far as I am concerned and have power to do so, I shall support it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to know how much this amendment would cost the Government.

Mr. BROWN. Eight million dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. What connection has this with the St. Lawrence waterway?

Mr. BROWN. It has no direct connection with the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it have any indirect connection with it?

Mr. BROWN. Only this, that ships which sail from Lake Superior to Lake Huron will use the canal. Was the Senator here when I made my short statement explaining the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I was not.

Mr. BROWN. The Office of Production Management, the President's Emergency Council, and Mr. Nelson's organization, all urge the immediate enactment of the measure. It has once passed the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 17. That hereafter the base pay of any enlisted man or warrant officer in the land, air, or naval forces of the United States shall

be increased by 20 percent, and the base pay of any commissioned officer in such forces shall be increased by 10 percent, for any period of service by him in the Philippine Islands, Midway Island, or Hawaii, or in any place outside of the United States which is not a part of its Territories or possessions.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the Senator's amendment merely incorporates a provision of law increasing the compensation paid to Army enlisted men and officers of the Army and the Navy who perform foreign service during wartime.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is entirely correct. I may add that it is precisely the provision of law that was on the statute books during the first World War, with the exception that I have in my amendment included Midway Island and Hawaii, because the situation is very materially changed in regard to them since the last war.

Mr. WALSH. In view of that situation, and in view of the fact that undoubtedly such a provision of law would sooner or later be adopted, I see no objection to attaching the amendment to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which is on the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the words "to such locations" and insert in lieu thereof the words "to the official residence of record for any such person, or, upon application by such dependents, to such other locations."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has conferred with me in reference to this amendment, which is an attempt upon his part to clarify some language which he thinks may be giving authority which is not contemplated by the bill, and I see no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to call up the amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 15. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons to assemble at or near any place where a labor dispute exists and by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, or for any person to promote, encourage, or aid any such assemblages at

which such force or violence, or threat thereof, is so used. As used in this section, the term "labor dispute" shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 2 (9) of the National Labor Relations Act.

(c) Any person who violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

(d) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the section and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am impressed with the vivid display of eager desire to do things here in Congress that will promote unity and strengthen the confidence of our people in the sincerity of our war effort.

Along this line I can think of nothing that will encourage and hearten our people more than for us to enact legislation which will tend to discourage fighting, bleeding, and dying on our domestic factory front right here at home. I refer to force and violence being employed in labor disputes.

While we read of battles raging on many fronts, and hang our heads in grief and sorrow at the loss of our loved ones, our foreign enemies read of hand-to-hand fighting in front of our defense factories and rejoice because this force and violence is stopping production of guns, ammunition and war equipment so sorely needed by our armed forces.

We were told at the time of Pearl Harbor that strikes would end. Those Hitler promises of our communistic labor leaders have been broken. This is no time to dilly-dally. While our boys are dying, are we going to stand idly by and permit force and violence to be used to prevent honest, patriotic laboring men from working on defense projects?

I offer again, for the fourth time since I came here, an antiviolence strike amendment and ask for its adoption by a yea and nay vote. If we are not in favor of the philosophy of government proclaimed in the amendment, pray tell me, Mr. President, what are we fighting Hitler, Italy, and Japan for? Their whole philosophy of operation is to get what they want by using force and violence. That is exactly what this amendment proposes to outlaw here in America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6446) was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof; the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and civilian employees of the executive departments, independent establishments, and agencies, during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes."

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM L. MITCHELL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 17 years ago today, on February 19, 1925, a man stood before a congressional committee here in Washington.

At that time this man described the Pacific defenses as "pitiable." At that time he testified before a congressional committee that the Japs could take the Philippines and Hawaii.

In the light of what was subsequently revealed by the Roberts Report, it is interesting to recall that 17 years ago today the same man testified that in October and November of 1924, when he visited Hawaii, the commanding general would not speak to the commanding admiral. According to the testimony which this man gave before the congressional committee at that time, "There is no cooperation at all out there."

That testimony was given on February 19, 1925. Exactly 11 years later, on February 19, 1936, just 6 years ago, the man who gave that testimony died, probably of a broken heart. Mr. President, that man was the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell.

Across the span of almost two decades his prophetic words come to haunt us today, to confront us with the challenge to organize our war effort realistically, with a proper recognition of the importance of our air force.

Mr. President, on February 1 the distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Bascom Timmons, long a personal friend of the late "Billy" Mitchell, wrote the story of Mitchell's warning about the Pacific. It is well for us to recall Mitchell's warning about the Pacific on the anniversary of his trial; and I ask that Mr. Timmons' article be inserted in full at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

MITCHELL'S WARNING ABOUT PACIFIC RECALLED ON ANNIVERSARY OF TRIAL—COURT-MARTIALED GENERAL SAID ARMY AND NAVY HEADS IN HAWAII WOULDN'T SPEAK TO EACH OTHER AND THAT DISASTER WAS CERTAIN

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Sixteen years ago today I sat in a Washington hotel room with a soldier of the United States. He had just been found guilty by a court martial. The trial had been under the ninety-sixth article of war, the catch-all, or so-called devil's clause of the Articles of War. On the following day he was to leave the Army. The soldier's name was William Mitchell.

He had been preparing a statement for the press and the country. I had looked it over, made a few suggestions. In my notes sometime later I found something he had written, then discarded and wrote again. It was in his own handwriting and formed the seventh paragraph of the statement he had written for release on February 1, 1926. It read:

"I look back on this record with the greatest pride and with satisfaction that I have done everything possible for my country. After all these years of service, not one dark spot can be found on my record and not one act which does not redound to the credit of the United States."

In my opinion, he was at that time the greatest authority on aviation in the world. Not only that, I believe then and believe now, that he knew more about all sorts of transportation than any man of his day.

He was the grandson of old Alexander Mitchell, who came to the shores of Lake Michigan a scant 20 years after Solomon Juneau, Milwaukee's first white citizen, arrived, and at a time when the Fort Dearborn massacre on the site of the present city of Chicago was fresh in men's minds. Alexander Mitchell had welded railroad short lines into the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, the first great railroad west of the Mississippi.

WAS VETERAN SOLDIER

Transportation and communication had always intrigued William Mitchell. He had been a foot soldier carrying a Krag rifle in Cuba and the Philippines. He had been a cavalryman. With a dog team he had helped Greeley complete the telegraph line in Alaska. The first automobile used in the Army had been in his outfit. He had pioneered the radio. The greatest concentration of allied air power ever participating in actual combat was entrusted to him.

General Mitchell in this statement, prepared on the last full day he served in the United States Army, charged that an Army and Navy oligarchy, entrenched behind a bureaucratic system, had attempted to bulldoze and coerce patriotic Army and Navy officers who disagreed with the views of this oligarchy. He had not been bulldozed, and he was going out. He concluded the statement:

"From now on I feel I can better serve my country and the flag I love by bringing a realization of the true conditions of our national defense straight to the people than by remaining muzzled in the Army. I shall always be on hand in case of war or emergency, whenever I am needed."

"Good-bye, General," I said, as I left him.

"Start calling me Mr. Mitchell," he replied with a smile, "but I am not through yet."

Mitchell's court martial came as no surprise to him, to the Army and Navy generally, or to anyone else of reasonable information in Washington. His number certainly had been up for almost a year—from the date of his testimony before the Lampert committee investigating aircraft, in February of 1925. He had vigorously attacked Secretary of War Weeks and Secretary of the Navy Wilbur and had described the Pacific defenses as "pitiable."

WARNED OF HAWAII WEAKNESS

It happens that I had also accompanied General Mitchell on that day. I sat at the table beside him as he shocked the committee by testifying that Japan could capture the Philippines and Hawaii in 2 weeks.

"An air force could reduce our Pacific islands easily, and we couldn't defend them with our present armament," said Mitchell.

"You say the Japs could take the Philippines and Hawaii and we could not stop it?" asked Representative Reid, Illinois.

"Of course," replied Mitchell. "Why, conditions are so bad out there that when I was in Hawaii last October and November I found the commanding general wouldn't speak to the commanding admiral, and they wouldn't even go to the same social functions together. There is no cooperation at all out there. The general and admiral even have separate and secret plans for taking Honolulu in case of war."

"How would they take Honolulu?" asked Congressman Perkins, of New Jersey.

OFFICERS INFURIATED

"Use force," replied Mitchell.

"You mean the general and the admiral at Pearl Harbor would fight each other?"

"The admiral at Pearl Harbor has plans to take Honolulu, and the general has plans to take it away from him if he does."

"You mean our Army would fight our Navy?"

"Yes," replied Mitchell.

That testimony infuriated both Army and Navy officers.

Mitchell also told the committee that the Army had only 19 effective pursuit planes, a statement which Secretary of War Weeks hotly denied, claiming it had 1,200.

Said Mitchell:

"We have only 19 pursuit planes and 15 pilots, not enough to man the planes we have. Of course, we have some obsolete planes, which, by the way, are good enough to sink any battleship afloat, but they would be no good in an air fight."

He told the committee the Army and Navy are old men, supporting each other, defending their ancient ways of doing things against the onrushing tide of public opinion and of modern inventions. They dress the air force in spurs, swords, and high collars. "We have to undress every time we get into an airplane," he said.

Gen. Hugh A. Drum, Assistant Chief of Staff, was present to testify in opposition to Mitchell.

"What does General Drum here know of air power?" asked Reid.

"Nothing whatever," replied Mitchell, looking directly at the reddening Drum.

ADMIRAL BACKS MITCHELL

A little later Admiral William S. Sims came to the stand to corroborate Mitchell's testimony. Sims was unpopular with the powers that be in the Navy and he didn't help in the feeling against Mitchell among the Army and Navy higher-ups.

Sims testified that 12 airplane carriers with 50 planes each could destroy the United States Fleet.

"But I am wasting my time telling you that," Sims said. "The conservatism of the military mind won't allow anything to be done about it. They never give in. Back in the Middle Ages the same sort of men hung onto their battle-axes and pikes and said that bows and arrows were not a serious menace until disaster overtook them. The airplane carrier is the capital ship of the future, because her bombing planes can reach and sink a battleship while the carrier continues to cruise swiftly out of range of the armored ship's guns."

In March Mitchell was reduced in rank from brigadier general to colonel and relieved of his high place in the War Department. From his post at San Antonio, Mitchell continued his battle.

On September 5, 1925, Mitchell burned all his bridges behind him, when, at San Antonio following the loss of the dirigible Shenandoah, he attributed frightful aeronautical accidents and loss of life directly to incompetence in the War and Navy Departments and characterized the administration of those departments as incompetent, criminally negligent, and almost treasonable.

"DISGUSTING PERFORMANCES"

He also charged the Navy with misleading the Nation as to facts shown by recent maneuvers near Hawaii. The plain facts were, he said, that "as far as Honolulu is concerned, it is not a position of decisive influence in the control of the Pacific. Its value consists in being an excellent submarine base to act against hostile surface craft and submarines. The control of the Pacific is our own territory of Alaska and the peninsula of Kamchatka opposite."

He concluded his statement:

"As a patriotic American citizen, I can no longer stand by and see those disgusting

performances by the Navy and War Departments at the expense of the lives of our people and the delusion of the American public.

"The bodies of my former companions in the air smoulder under the soil of America, Asia, Europe, and Africa, many, yes, a great many, directly by official stupidity.

"This, then, is what I have to say on this subject, and I hope every American will hear it."

PLACED ON TRIAL

The ninety-sixth article of war was invoked against him and Mitchell was placed on trial on October 28. He was charged with having "conducted himself to the prejudice of good order and military discipline and in a way to bring discredit upon the military service by making, uttering, and publishing statements charging that those administering the War and Navy Departments were 'incompetent, criminally negligent, and almost treasonable.'"

Mitchell at that time was 45 years old, but easily could have passed for 35. After a long trial Mitchell was convicted. He was suspended from all rank and duty for 5 years and to total forfeiture of pay and allowance.

President Coolidge, upon review, approved the first part of the sentence, but held that Mitchell during his suspension should receive half his nonflying pay and certain living allowances "during the pleasure of the President."

CAUSED UPROAR IN CONGRESS

The conviction caused an uproar in Congress. Representative Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, immediately introduced a resolution restoring Mitchell to his former rank of brigadier general, placing him in command of the air forces of the United States and suspending Maj. Gen. Dennis Nolan and Hugh A. Drum from the Army for 5 years and assessing against General King and Graves of the court which convicted him a fine of one-half of their salaries for 5 years. Representative LaGuardia, now mayor of New York, introduced a resolution cutting Mitchell's sentence to 30 days. Both resolutions were smothered.

Mitchell, feeling that the sentence was such as to hold him in bondage for the next 5 years, submitted his resignation.

WROTE ON AVIATION

Mitchell retired to his home in Virginia. For a time he contemplated opening an aviation school in association with Eddie Rickenbacker and others, but gave up the notion.

He wrote on aviation subjects from time to time, but ceased this when his health became impaired. He died 10 years after his court martial, February 19, 1936.

Two weeks ago the Senate passed a bill restoring the rank of brigadier general to Mitchell. It now pends in the House.

And this week Congress passed the \$12,000,000,000 appropriation bill providing for the procurement of 23,000 combat and 10,000 training planes, and General Marshall announced that the production of heavy bombers is reaching nearly 1,000 monthly.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the contemplated adjournment the Senate Committee on Appropriations be authorized to make reports to the Senate on bills and resolutions, that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO REPORT SENATE RESOLUTION 224

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the contemplated adjournment the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to report Senate Resolution 224, and that the clerk shall then automatically refer the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRODUCTION OF RUBBER FROM GUAYULE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand it is the intention of the majority leader to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday. There is now on the calendar the so-called guayule bill, which has been considered twice by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and reported to the Senate without opposition both times. It has also passed the Senate without any opposition. The measure was vetoed because of a House amendment which was not contained in the bill as passed by the Senate. It is most important that this bill be passed without delay. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2282) to provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") is authorized—

(1) To acquire by purchase, license, or other agreement, the right to operate under processes or patents relating to the growing and harvesting of guayule or the extraction of rubber therefrom, and such properties, processes, records, and data as are necessary to such operation, including but not limited to any such rights owned or controlled by the Intercontinental Rubber Co., or any of its subsidiaries, and all equipment, materials, structures, factories, real property, seed, seedlings, growing shrub, and other facilities, patents, and processes of the Intercontinental Rubber Co., or any of its subsidiaries, located in California, and for such rights, properties, and facilities of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. or any of its subsidiaries, the Secretary is authorized to pay not to exceed \$2,000,000;

(2) To plant, or contract for the planting of, not in excess of 75,000 acres of guayule in areas in the Western Hemisphere where the best growth and yields may be expected in order to maintain a nucleus planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber as well as of planting material for use in further expanding guayule planting to meet emergency needs of the United States for crude rubber; to establish and maintain nurseries to provide seedlings for field plants; and to purchase necessary equipment, facilities, and land for nurseries;

(3) To acquire by lease, or other agreement, for not exceeding 10 years, rights to land for the purpose of making plantings of guayule; to make surveys directly or through appropriate Government agencies of areas in the Western Hemisphere where guayule might be grown; and to establish and maintain records indicating areas to which guayule cultivation could be extended for emergency production;

(4) To construct or operate, or to contract for the operation of, factories for the extraction of rubber from guayule, and from *Chrysothamnus*, commonly known as rabbit brush; and to purchase, operate, and maintain equipment for the harvesting, storing, transporting, and complete processing of guayule, and *Chrysothamnus*, commonly known as rabbit brush, and to purchase land as sites for processing plants;

(5) To conduct studies, in which he may cooperate with any other public or private agency, designed to increase the yield of guayule by breeding or by selection, and to improve planting methods; to make surveys of areas suitable for cultivating guayule; to make experimental plantings; and to conduct agronomic tests;

(6) To conduct tests, in which he may cooperate with any other public or private agency, to determine the qualities of rubber obtained from guayule and to determine the most favorable methods of compounding and using guayule in rubber-manufacturing processes;

(7) To improve methods of processing guayule shrubs and rubber and to obtain and hold patents on such new processes;

(8) To sell guayule or rubber processed from guayule and to use funds so obtained in replanting and maintaining an area of 75,000 acres of guayule inside the Western Hemisphere; and

(9) To exercise with respect to rubber-bearing plants other than guayule the same powers as are granted in the foregoing provisions of this section with respect to guayule.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized to appoint such employees, including citizens of countries in the Western Hemisphere, as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act. Such appointments may be made without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, and the compensation of the persons so appointed may be fixed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. All appointments so made by the Secretary shall be made only on the basis of merit and efficiency.

(b) The Secretary may delegate any of the powers and duties conferred on him by this act to any agency or bureau of the Department of Agriculture.

(c) The Secretary, with the consent of any board, commission, independent establishment, corporation, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, may avail himself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof, in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(d) The Secretary may allot to bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture, or may transfer to such other agencies of the State and Federal Governments as may be requested by him to assist in carrying out this act, any funds made available to him under this act.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Any amounts so appropriated, and any funds received by the Secretary under this act, shall remain permanently available for the purposes of this act without regard to the provisions of any other laws relating to the availability and disposition of appropriated funds and the disposition of funds collected by officers or agencies of the United States.

DISPOSITION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 2255, to establish a policy with respect to the disposition of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation, so that it may be the unfinished business. It is the so-called parity bill, and is Calendar No. 1090.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill being made the unfinished business. I will say to the Senator that in all likelihood there will not be a great deal of business transacted Monday. Of course, Washington's Farewell Address will be read. Because it is a holiday many Members may be out of town to fill engagements elsewhere, and it may not be wise to proceed with the consideration of the measure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I shall not be contentious about the matter. I do not want action to be taken on the measure Monday. I simply wanted to have the bill made the unfinished business, so Senators would be on notice that it will be considered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, with the understanding that the consideration of the measure will go over until Tuesday, if it appears that it should go over, I have no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall not be contentious about the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2255) to establish a policy with respect to the disposition of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of Gabriel J. Chopp to be postmaster at Ahmeek, Mich., in place of G. J. Chopp.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward N. Jones to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic

and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the diplomatic nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 23, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of February 13), 1942:

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Edward N. Jones to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for Pennsylvania.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

To be Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Alvin M. Bentley
Byron E. Blankinship
D. Chadwick Braggiotti
Robert M. Brandin
William C. Burdett, Jr.
Findley Burns, Jr.
Robert E. Cashin
Forrest N. Daggett
Frederick W. Eysell
Douglas N. Forman, Jr.
Michael R. Gannett
Joseph N. Greene, Jr.
Henry Hanson, Jr.
Douglas Henderson
Armistead M. Lee
Duane B. Lueders
LaRue R. Lutkins
Oliver M. Marcy
James L. O'Sullivan
Albert E. Pappano
Henry L. Pitts, Jr.
William S. Rosenberg
Joseph S. Sparks
Leslie Albion Squires
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr.
Jewell Truex
Richard E. Usher
Theodore C. Weber
William L. S. Williams

PROMOTIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

To be a Foreign Service officer of class 1
George L. Brandt
To be Foreign Service officers of class 2
Ralph H. Ackerman
J. Webb Benton
Edward M. Groth
H. Lawrence Groves
Donald R. Heath
James Hugh Keeley, Jr.
Alfred W. Klieforth

Thomas H. Lockett
Robert B. Macatee
Hugh Millard
Orsen N. Nielsen
Daniel J. Reagan
Harold S. Tewell

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3

George Atcheson, Jr.
Merwin L. Bohan
J. Rives Childs
Charles E. Dickerson, Jr.
Julian B. Foster
Clayton Lane
James E. McKenna
Paul G. Minneman
Paul O. Nyhus
Karl L. Rankin
Leo D. Sturgeon
Clifford C. Taylor
John Carter Vincent

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4

George R. Canty
Robert G. Glover
Julian C. Greenup
George J. Haering
Joel C. Hudson
Charles W. Lewis, Jr.
Lester De Witt Mallory
Quincy F. Roberts
James Somerville
Paul P. Steintorf
Howard H. Tewksbury
S. Walter Washington

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5

Richard M. de Lambert
Samuel G. Ebling
George R. Hukill
Benjamin M. Hulley
Paul W. Meyer
Sheldon T. Mills
Sidney E. O'Donoghue
James B. Pilcher
Robert B. Streeper

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6

Stuart Allen
John M. Allison
Cavendish W. Cannon
William P. Cochran, Jr.
Edmund J. Dorsz
Dorsey Gassaway Fisher
Frederic C. Fornes, Jr.
Archibald E. Gray
Bernard Gufier
Monroe B. Hall
Thomas A. Hickok
Perry N. Jester
George D. LaMont
Edward S. Maney
Ralph Miller
Gerald A. Mokma
Guy W. Ray
Willard Quincy Stanton
Walter N. Walmsley, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 7

Mulford A. Colebrook
Charles A. Cooper
Frederick J. Cunningham
Overton G. Ellis, Jr.
Howard Elting, Jr.
Frederick E. Farnsworth
L. Randolph Higgs
Beppo R. Johansen
George Lewis Jones, Jr.
Charles F. Knox, Jr.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr.
Walter J. Linthicum
Aubrey E. Lippincott
Odin G. Loren
Robert Mills McClintock
Carmel Offie
Walter W. Orebaugh
W. Leonard Parker
Max W. Schmidt

To be Foreign Service officers of class 8

John L. Bankhead
M. Williams Blake
Thomas S. Campen
David M. Clark

Perry Ellis
James Espy
Richard D. Gatewood
John L. Goshie
John Hubner 2d
John D. Jernegan
Hartwell Johnson
Robert B. Memminger
Charles S. Millet
Miss Kathleen Molesworth
Bolard More
Brewster H. Morris
Jack B. Neathery
Miss Katherine E. O'Connor
E. Edward Schefer
Charles O. Thompson
S. Roger Tyler, Jr.
Philip P. Williams
Robert E. Wilson

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Mary A. Morrison, Climax.
Clarence Patterson, Steamboat Springs.

MISSOURI

Villa R. Harris, Annapolis.
Elmer W. Brown, Farmington.

NEW JERSEY

Charles Leon Ware, Glassboro.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Jacob S. Payton, D. D., executive secretary, Methodist Commission on Camp Activities, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, innumerable tokens of Thy grace and bounties from Thy hand lead us to turn to Thee in reverence and gratitude. Because Thou hast repeatedly shown forbearance with our past failures, we seek again Thy forgiveness and compassion.

Fortify, O Lord, the hearts of our citizens with the presence of all honorable things. There may truth, loyalty, and courage have their habitation, that from these inner resources America may be outwardly strong. Be not far, O Lord, from our defenders who stand in perilous places. In mercy minister to such as suffer the agony of wounds, and out of Thy immeasurable love comfort such as have been bereft of kinsmen lost in battle.

Keep America steadfast in her reliance upon Thee, O Lord, who art the unfailing light amidst the world's darkness, and in whose keeping are the imperishable treasures in a day when, because of the folly of evildoers, so much beauty and strength have become a residue of ruin and destruction.

Endow with the wisdom which is from above these Thy servants to whom has been entrusted the destiny of our country during these grave and troublous times. May they keep their honor bright, their motives unselfish, and their trust in Thee immovable. Thus may the deliberations of this day be such as shall not only safeguard all former costly gains of freedom, but contribute also to the future security and welfare of our people. This prayer we offer in the name of Jesus, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter from Hon. Jesse Jones to the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a brief editorial from the Emporia Gazette by William Allen White.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSE OF PERSONS DISCHARGED FROM THE ARMY

Mr. MAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1782) to authorize the payment of a donation to and to provide for the travel at Government expense of persons discharged from the Army of the United States on account of fraudulent enlistment, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

ALLOWANCES FOR UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1891) to amend an act to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army so as to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Army of the United States, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana? There was no objection.

[Mr. O'CONNOR addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when I was in Sault Ste. Marie last week end I discussed the Soo lock situation with military authorities, with marine operators, with marine construction engineers, and many others. All wholeheartedly approved of the sincere effort myself and many other Members of Congress have made to secure adequate defense protection at the Sault and to

secure passage of S. 2132, authorizing the construction of a new imperatively needed lock. All repeatedly warned that failure to provide both of these features might conceivably lead to national disaster. The fact was particularly stressed that because of the pending shortage of needed construction materials, such as steel and concrete, if this Congress does not act immediately in the passage of S. 2132, the ultimate completion of this new lock may be delayed from 1 to several years. Congress must act and should act immediately. It is my purpose therefore, Mr. Speaker, to place on the Clerk's desk as soon as our legislative regulations will permit a discharge petition to force S. 2132 to the floor for action. We have already dilly-dallied with this important question for 9 long and important months. Let us wake up.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio speech I made last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? There was no objection.

[Mr. CLUETT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LOCKS AT THE SOO

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, certain gentlemen from Michigan seem to be trying to force the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to bring out a separate pet measure they have, the object of which is to break into the rivers and harbors bill and pass the Soo project at a cost of about \$8,000,000. We are going to see whether or not these gentlemen are going to back up their words. The river and harbor bill which contains this particular project at Sault Ste. Marie will probably be before the House in a few days, and if the gentlemen from Michigan who are seeking this special favor, and who are trying to break into the river and harbor bill, are really sincere in their desire to have this improvement at the Soo, they will support the river and harbor bill in order that the President may put into operation immediately those projects necessary for national defense, for the preservation of this Government, and authorize such projects as may be deemed necessary for a backlog to help absorb unemployment after the emergency is over.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Is this that "pork barrel" bill that the gentleman's committee is going to bring in here?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; it is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania may call a "pork barrel" bill, since it is not all in Pennsylvania, but it contains many items that are absolutely necessary to national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PENSIONS FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the people of the country have made it unmistakably clear to the membership of this body that they disapprove the enactment of the so-called congressional pension legislation.

Since this is still a democracy in which the will of the people should ever prevail, let us give our immediate attention to the business of repealing this objectionable legislation, to the wiping of it from the statute books as quickly as we can.

It cannot be done too soon to please me. Since I voted against pensions for Congressmen in 1939, when they were first proposed, and did not vote for the legislation which passed the House a few weeks ago, the elimination of this legislation will cause me no pangs of regret.

If for no other reason, the act should be repealed because it has disturbed the national unity, which is so essential to the winning of the war in which we are engaged. Its elimination will bring about a much better feeling in the country.

In these days when the future of our country hangs in the balance, better had we endeavor to emulate the example of that veteran of World War No. 1, the heroic Martin Treptow, when, in the midst of his "blood, sweat, and tears," he wrote in his notebook:

America must win this war. Therefore I will work; I will save; I will sacrifice; I will endure; I will fight cheerfully and do my utmost, as if the issue of the whole struggle depended on me alone.

Only by the development of such a spirit of sacrifice in which all of our people can be united can we win this war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an article taken from the American Federation of Labor newspaper written by Phillip Pearl.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert an address I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE LOCKS AT THE SOO

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, referring to the colloquy which has just occurred between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in respect to the Soo Locks, I call the attention of the House to what everyone in the War Department, the Navy Department, and the War Production Board, and so forth, is asking, is that we protect the very vital raw material which goes into the manufacture of our guns, tanks, and planes. Out of 93,000,000 tons of iron ore produced in this country last year, of which steel is made, 83,000,000 tons of that went through the Soo Locks. This is a defense measure and should be completely divorced from the rivers and harbors bill, many of the subjects of which are highly controversial and of doubtful defense value. We should not have to tie up the protection of our raw material with the Tombigbee, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River project, the Florida ship canal project, and other highly controversial measures.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] had to say a few minutes ago, the situation with reference to the Soo Locks has been described here not only once but several times by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. We just heard what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] had to say. The improvement at the Soo is a necessary defense measure, and if the gentleman from Mississippi thinks he is going to compel us to swallow all of that dirty, nasty, greasy pork that has been stuck into the rivers and harbors bill, in order to put through a defense measure, he is very much mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long it is going to be before some of our high officials come to a realization that they have a duty to perform. We have the spectacle of Princess Hohenloë, who has moved in close to the seat of operations in Alexandria. We have Fritz Kuhn, on whom I have been trying to get some action for two and a half years. We have Robert Noble, who comes out on December 8 and supports the Axis. We have Harry Bridges. The only thing we can get is unsatisfactory conversation

and explanations from these people, and words. We never get any real answers wherein they take action. Constant splitting of hairs, always in favor of the enemies of the United States.

I hope the House will begin to think seriously about getting rid of some of these subversive interests before they do us any more damage than they have done. This is a time of war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ANSEL WOLD

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time in order to heartily congratulate and pay brief tribute to one of the most capable and valuable servants of the Congress, on the fortieth anniversary of the commencement of this service. He came to the Census Office as a boy of 19, back in 1900. He resigned this position in less than 2 years to accept one in the document room 40 years ago today. After several months there he was transferred to the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and continued to serve in various capacities until 1910, when he became Printing Clerk of the Senate in the office of the Secretary, in which position he rendered yeoman service until 1921, when he was unanimously elected, without solicitation on his part, as clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing, to succeed Clerk George H. Carter, who at that time was appointed Public Printer. Since that time, as you all know, he has rendered very valuable service as clerk to that committee, in which position he is now serving.

I deem it scarcely necessary to say that I refer to that valuable public servant, Ansel Wold.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to heartily concur in everything the gentleman has said, and underscore all of it.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

I am quite sure that his vast knowledge of all printing matters and Government departments, his industry, efficiency, patriotism, and loyalty, have, throughout the years, caused all Printing Committee chairmen to lean very heavily on the broad shoulders of his great experience—just as Senator HAYDEN and I now do; not only this, but his knowledge and experience have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Government.

I believe I speak the sentiment, not only of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] but of the entire membership of this House, when in congratulating Ansel Wold on the fine and valuable service he has rendered to us I also express to him the sincere hope that God may grant him many years of future service in this same capacity. May I add the expression of hope that each of those years and each of those days may be as pleasant and as happy

and as satisfying to Ansel Wold as they will be valuable to the Nation he loves.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] in paying tribute to Ansel Wold, secretary of the Joint Committee on Printing, for the valuable service he has rendered the committee. During the time I have served on the Joint Committee on Printing and the Committee on Printing of the House, I think that Ansel Wold has been a very industrious, honest, and diligent servant of the committee. He has at all times kept his eye on those things which are for the best interests of this country. Ansel Wold gives his entire time to this service. He is kind. He is considerate. He wants to do that thing which is best at all times, in saving in printing cost. I know that my chairman on this committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has a valuable assistant in trying to see that everything we do is in accordance with the law, because he has been there so long that he knows the law relative to public printing almost word for word.

I also want to say that in my association with the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN], he is one of the valuable Members of this House. When you have men like PETE JARMAN and Ansel Wold on a committee, surely you will get good results. I congratulate Ansel Wold on his service of 21 years on the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives and his 40 years of service to the Government in Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I also want to take my hat off to Ansel Wold. I possibly have been one of the most severe critics of printing expenditures authorized by the Congress down through the years. That criticism has been in an effort to better conditions—for the benefit of the Treasury and eliminate unnecessary printing. We always receive sound and unbiased advice from Ansel Wold. He is not political in any sense of the word. He has at heart the real interests of the country and the Treasury. He is reliable. May we have more public servants like Ansel Wold.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I find it necessary to stand in the Well of the House today and protest

against the remarks made yesterday by my friend and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I do not believe at this crucial time we should mix politics or say anything on the floor of this House that would be detrimental to our national defense program and that goes for both sides of the aisle, as this is the time when the American people should be united as one.

I am going to read one paragraph from the remarks of this gentleman yesterday which he made on the floor of the House. It reads as follows:

If the President of the United States wanted to do something for America, he would stop his political meddling, he would attend to those things most important; on the other hand, he would at least try to stop the war in labor unions, or win the war he successfully maneuvered us into all over the world.

The part that I object to is where he states that the President successfully maneuvered us into this war. I deny that statement as I believe our President did everything possible to keep us out of this war; in fact he went to the extreme in trying to keep peace with Japan. I feel that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should have that part of his remarks stricken from the permanent RECORD.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I do not apologize for those remarks.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then the gentleman does not, in my opinion, believe in the unity and harmony of the American people in trying to win this war, if he permits his remarks to remain unchanged. This is no time to play politics.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have asked for this time because of the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in which he said he does not apologize for his remarks.

The remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and quoted by the gentleman from New York are wholly inconsistent with the truth. The statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is as inconsistent with the truth of a historical fact than any I have heard in my entire life.

Statements of that kind are the best tools that could be furnished Hitler and the Japanese with which to initiate division in this country. If one were paid by Hitler or by the Japanese to make a statement that would cause division in this country, neither Hitler nor the Japanese could have a more effective statement made that would aid their cause nor one that is more completely inconsistent with the truth.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roll of the committees.

AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION ACT OF 1931

Mrs. NORTON (when the Committee on Labor was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Labor, I call up the bill (H. R. 5638) to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 is amended by adding the following section:

"Sec. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary for allotment to agencies of the United States and for advances to the States, Territories, and island possessions, and the agencies and political subdivisions thereof, by the President, through the Federal Works Agency or such agencies as he may designate, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the making of such examinations, surveys, investigations, legal studies, comprehensive plans and programs, engineering plans and specifications, and forms of legal proceedings, as may be necessary to facilitate and expedite the selection, financing, and inauguration of public improvements, works, and related activities: *Provided*, That advances to States, Territories, and island possessions, and political subdivisions thereof, shall be subject to such requirements as to reimbursement, or with respect to contribution of funds, services, or materials, as the President may determine."

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather important matter, and I believe the membership of the House should be present to hear the debate. I therefore make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Arnold	Jenks, N. H.	Sacks
Baldwin	Jensen	Schaefer, Ill.
Butler	Johnson	Short
Byron	Lyndon B.	Smith, Pa.
Celler	Kleberg	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, Md.	Kramer	Sparkman
Cole, N. Y.	Lambertson	Stratton
Crawford	McGregor	Sweeney
Crowther	McMillan	Taber
Culkin	Magnuson	Tolan
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Voorhis, Calif.
Gibson	Martin, Mass.	Vreeland
Gillette	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Guyer	Monroney	Walter
Hancock	O'Day	Weiss
Harness	Oliver	White
Hendricks	Osmer	Wilson
Hook	Rankin, Mont.	Winter
Jacobsen	Rizley	Worley
Jarrett	Romjue	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 372 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on the Civil Service may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. RAMSPECK)?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of including two corrections in respect to material inserted in my remarks of February 6 in reference to the O. C. D. and the F. C. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. WIGGLESWORTH)?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Louisville Courier Journal showing that the Legislature of Kentucky has passed the T. V. A. Act by a vote of 85 to 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. RANKIN)?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6548) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION ACT OF 1931

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes in order to explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BEITER)?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which is before the House this afternoon is really a very simple matter. It involves no more than an amendment to the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 authorizing an appropriation to be used for the preparation now of plans for public works and related activities to be undertaken in the post-war period. The plans will be prepared by Federal agencies and State and local governments. State and local governments will make plans with funds advanced by the Federal Government. These funds will be subject to provisions for reimbursement and contribution.

This bill provides for no more than the preparation of plans. In no way does the bill authorize or appropriate funds for the construction of the projects so planned.

Though this bill is a very simple matter, and its consideration should not de-

tain the House long this afternoon, it is nonetheless quite important. The President has said that we are not going to lose the peace. In time of war we must prepare for peace. Otherwise all that we fight for may be lost. Planning for peace is in a very real sense part of our war effort.

The problem of planning for the peace is a very complicated one—one which must engage the efforts of all branches of government and of private industry. Many of the Federal agencies and many private industries and associations, including labor groups, have already begun to plan for the post-war period.

But effective planning for the peace cannot be carried out in all spheres without additional authorizations from the Congress. The Committee on Labor agree unanimously that additional authorization is needed in the field of public works planning if the Federal, State, and local governments are to cooperate in preparing detailed plans for post-war activities. It is the purpose of this bill, whose major provisions I have just outlined, to provide the necessary authorization.

This bill was introduced at the instance of the President of the United States, who made recommendations in two of his messages to the first session of this Congress. In his annual Budget message of January 3, a year ago, the President, while recommending the deferment of construction projects that would interfere with the defense program, stated that—and I quote:

Surveys and the planning of new projects will go forward so that construction can be resumed without delay. This will produce a long list of public-work projects, apart from defense construction, arranged according to priorities. Such a list could be submitted to a future Congress for the appropriation of funds to put it into operation.

Again, in his message of March 17 of last year, transmitting the annual report of the National Resources Planning Board, the President recommended storing up a reservoir of nondefense work which can be loosed when the pace of war production slackens. He then said:

If projects are to be ready at hand for rapid inauguration in times of need, the surveys and investigations, the engineering plans and specifications must be prepared in advance. * * * The planning * * * fund, suggested in the Board's report, would make available a shelf of useful projects without in any way committing the Government to the immediate construction of such works.

Let me now make it very clear that this bill, if enacted, will not mean increased Federal control over the activities of State and local governments. On the contrary, this bill provides for "grass roots" planning. Advances will be made to State and local governments for plan preparation by their own staffs and consultants. There will be no Federal domination of the design and planning work of State and local governments. In fact, representatives of State and local governments are among the most ardent supporters of this legislation. The United States Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the International City Managers' Association,

the Municipal Finance Officers' Association, and representatives of various State and municipal governments, including the cities of New York and Chicago, and the States of Virginia, Maryland, and Idaho, have all urged us to pass this bill.

The purpose of this bill is not to authorize a mere inventory of public works which might be undertaken at a future date. If such were the purpose, I should not call the bill a planning bill. The purpose of the bill is, rather, to advance funds for surveys and the preparation of complete plans for individual projects. We would not just count projects; we would plan them.

This bill may be looked upon as a form of insurance—insurance against unpreparedness; insurance against a post-war collapse. The authorization provided in this bill assures that if and when such time comes, plans will be ready and, if the Congress so legislates, men and materials can be put to work more quickly and on better undertakings than would otherwise be the case.

The necessity for advance planning as a form of insurance against unpreparedness has been demonstrated to the Congress on several occasions during recent years. The public-works program of the 1930's amply demonstrated that many months may elapse between the making of appropriations for a large program of public improvements and the actual employment of great numbers of men. This delay was occasioned by the time necessary to carry out the preliminary surveys, studies, and investigations; to make the detailed plans and specifications; to arrange for financing—in short, the delay was occasioned by the necessity for planning after the appropriations were made for the construction program. We were unprepared to meet the emergency. We were forced to resort to all sorts of temporary projects. Advance planning is the proper insurance against such costly unpreparedness. And it is advance planning which this bill would authorize.

More recently the Congress has recognized the absolute necessity for advance planning as a form of insurance against the war emergency.

In fact, the Congress has not only recognized the necessity for advance planning of construction projects in the war emergency, but we have, on our own initiative, taken positive action to meet this need. The Appropriations Committee of this House a year ago added to a Budget estimate for military-post construction the sum of \$15,000,000 for advance engineering plans and surveys. In reporting this action to the whole House, the committee stated:

The committee has included in the amount for military-post construction an item of \$15,000,000 for engineering surveys. * * * Such a study can be completed in this fiscal year and will result in providing an essential measure of preparedness, both in point of time and cost on any future construction that may become necessary.

The far-sightedness of our Appropriations Committee in this case has certainly been duly rewarded. This action was taken long before Pearl Harbor. Today we are saving valuable time and

money by expanding our camps and cantonments in accord with plans prepared in advance under this appropriation.

Let us be just as far-sighted in our planning for the post-war period. The bill now before this House recognizes the necessity for advance planning as a form of insurance against a post-war emergency.

The proposed legislation has the unanimous approval of the President and representatives of the Federal departments, including the Bureau of the Budget, the National Resources Planning Board, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Works Agency, the Federal Security Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. In hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on an identical bill (S. 1617), unanimous support was accorded the principles contained in this legislation by representatives of labor, agriculture, professional engineers, architects, planners, and educators, the construction industry, citizens' organizations, and State and municipal governments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I have received this morning a telegram from the American Association of General Contractors now assembled in convention in Indianapolis, Ind., in which they wholeheartedly endorse this program. I ask unanimous consent that this telegram be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., February 19, 1942.

HON. ALFRED BEITER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

POST-WAR PROGRAM

Whereas following the victory, to which we look forward, will require the assimilation of the national strength and energy for the purposes of peace instead of for purposes of war; and

Whereas, this assimilation should be immediate and should be directed to catching up with peacetime needs; and

Whereas the preparing for such a task should be undertaken at the earliest moment so that it will not be necessary to improvise programs of the future; and

Whereas there is now before the Congress proposals to amend the Employment Stabilization Act (H. R. 5638 and S. 1617) to facilitate such advance exploration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Associated General Contractors of America in convention assembled at Indianapolis, Ind., February 16-18, 1942, That the principle embodied in these proposals is endorsed with the understanding that such post-war planning will utilize the existing facilities for such programming as the same pertain to public works and that such planning contemplate full utilization of

the resources in construction skill as are available through private enterprise.

J. M. SWEM.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does the gentleman have an endorsement from the architects of the country and the planning boards of the country?

Mr. BEITER. Yes. Let this House follow the advice of accredited representatives of labor, industry, citizens' organizations, and State and local governments, and give our support to this legislation at this time.

I have been asked two or three times during the roll call how much this new venture will cost the Federal Government. In reference to its cost, may I make two points very clear:

First. The amount of money to be appropriated for this activity in any one year is left entirely to the discretion of the President, the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress. The bill does not constitute an authorization which automatically commits the Congress to the appropriation of any given sum.

Second. It will be very easy for the President, the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress to arrive at the amount to be appropriated. There need be no guesswork, no rough estimating.

The money to be appropriated will be used for two purposes—comprehensive and general plans and detailed plans and specifications. Concerning the latter, which require by far the greater expenditure, the amount to be appropriated at any time depends entirely upon two determinable factors: First, the total volume or value of public work upon which it is desired to prepare plans; and, second, the extent or degree of completion to which it is desired to prepare the plans. Let us assume, for example, that the Congress decides at a given time that, as a matter of policy, it would be desirable to have preliminary plans prepared on \$500,000,000 of public work. About one-half of the plan making on this volume of work would probably be conducted with the existing facilities and funds of Federal, State, and local agencies. Plans and specifications on the remaining \$250,000,000 of public work would be undertaken with appropriations under this bill. The cost of preliminary plans might average about 3 percent of the value of the work being planned; so that, in order to carry out its original policy determination, the Congress would appropriate \$7,500,000—3 percent of \$250,000,000.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman make the statement in connection with this bill that it will not be possible for any funds to be spent in connection with its administration unless they are appropriated by the Congress as funds in connection with it?

Mr. BEITER. I certainly will.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman will state that funds in connection with the administration of this bill cannot be taken from any other funds the President or anyone else may have under their control?

Mr. BEITER. Those charged with administering this bill must come back to the Congress, and it is up to the Congress to make the appropriations. The President, the Appropriations Committee, and the Congress must pass on it before any money can be spent.

The cost of more definite plans might average about 5 percent of the value of the work being planned instead of 3 percent; so that, if the Congress should decide at a given time that, as a matter of policy, more detailed plans should be prepared on the same volume, then it would appropriate \$12,500,000—5 percent of \$250,000,000—instead of \$7,500,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I shall not object—I should like to know how long the gentleman has been proceeding.

The SPEAKER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We are considering this bill under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have no objection to the gentleman being allowed additional time, but some of us are opposed to this bill, and we should like to have additional time.

Mr. BEITER. I think that can be arranged.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understood before this matter came before the House that we were to have an hour, to which we are entitled, at least under the rule. Later the chairman of the committee asked unanimous consent that we consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole, which meant consideration under the 5-minute rule. We did not hear that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated the request of the chairman of the committee to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole and asked if there was objection, and there was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not finding any fault with that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Without going into the merits of the bill let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill is what I call an unlimited authorization. I have opposed all such bills that have come to the floor of this House. Will not the gentleman himself put in some specific amount? As the bill is now worded, the sky is the limit under its

provisions. Gentlemen say, of course, that this is merely an authorization and that you cannot get any money unless the Appropriations Committee gives it to you, but assuming the Appropriations Committee wants to go to the sky on an appropriation for this purpose, where will you be? Does not the gentleman believe there should be a ceiling in the way of an authorization?

Mr. BEITER. Knowing the members of the Appropriations Committee as I do and the way they operate, the number of hearings they hold, and the thoroughness with which they go into requests for appropriations, I have confidence in them and I rest my case with the members of the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; but the same members of the Appropriations Committee may not be here next year; you cannot tell, nor can I. We do not know who is going to be here.

Mr. BEITER. They are a splendid group of gentlemen, and I hope they continue in office many, many years.

Mr. COCHRAN. So do I, but that is not the question. We should not legislate on an assumption the personnel of any committee will protect us, but we should legislate to protect a committee, and committees need protection at times.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that if that argument were carried to its legitimate conclusion there would be no occasion for legislation of this kind in the first instance; and in the second place, if we are not to have legislative authorizations, we might just as well abolish the functions of the legislative committees and leave it entirely to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman failed to tell us that this measure has as its purpose the freezing in of W. P. A. and making an emergency agency a permanent part of the Government. Is not this correct?

Mr. BEITER. To make W. P. A. a permanent agency?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. BEITER. No; it is quite the contrary. The gentleman will recall that during the depression we passed in the Congress a public works bill which worked directly to the opposite of the W. P. A. Private contractors were employed and projects originated in the municipalities. They advertised for bids, they employed local men, paid the regular rate of wage, and it was because of the splendid work that was accomplished through the Public Works Administration that many men who were formerly employed on W. P. A. were able to get much better jobs under the public-works program.

Mr. BENDER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that today there is a shortage of engineers everywhere throughout the

country and that engineering skill is needed for the war effort rather than after the war?

Mr. BEITER. I appreciate that, but I assume that in the gentleman's own city they have a planning organization. The city of Cleveland, I am sure, has a planning association. The purpose of this bill is not to engage additional men or force the cities to engage additional men. The National Resources Planning Board will cooperate with your local city planning agency or your State planning agency in the preparation of these plans. They may even suggest to them that if they have a project which they contemplate constructing at this time, to defer the work until after the emergency.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am wondering in what position private enterprise or local responsibility is left if this bill becomes law.

Mr. BEITER. Any plan for the construction of a project in a given municipality originates with a sponsor or with the municipality itself.

Mr. DONDERO. That means they have got to come to Washington and get the funds with which to build according to that program?

Mr. BEITER. No. Of course, that would require additional legislation and would be determined by the policy adopted by the Congress after the emergency. This merely provides for the preparation of plans, so that the country will not experience the same difficulties of a severe depression and unemployment it did after the World War.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] said that this is a very short and a very simple bill. With that I agree. I recognize as most others recognize that the monumental and enormous things come in short and simple form. I am reminded of my service during the World War on the western front, when it became necessary, among a variety of duties, to censor the mails of the boys who wrote back home. Those who were given to pouring out their devotion and loyalty and love to their sweethearts back home in beautiful, lofty, and alliterative phrases for 30 or 40 pages, seldom said anything about the location of the troops or revealed military information. It was the lad who would take a postal card and say, "Dear Mom, we landed today at this spot on this day at this hour" and in compression of a single sentence disclosed many military secrets. It is in the compression of this bill that you will find real food for thought.

Let me say I doubt if there is a single Member of the House who is unmindful of the fact that when this conflict is over

there will be a tremendous job of post-war planning. Everyone recognizes that. Everyone realizes there will be dislocations of business and employment and that the slack must be taken up by some kind of a program. But when it is suggested, as it is in the pending bill, that an over-all, endless, limitless, permanent authority be vested in the hands of the President of the United States without a single guide line, then I say it is time for the Congress to stop, look, and listen.

The language of the bill states the whole case. Listen to me for a moment: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually."

What does it mean? It means a permanent annual authorization. Once it goes on the books you know and I know that it will never be repealed. Once we had a Congressman from New York who came to Congress on the platform of repealing one law a day. It is not in derogation of him or any aspersion upon his legislative ability, that he did not get a single act repealed. When this goes on the books, you know and I know that it will not be repealed. It is a permanent, annual authorization. For how much? For any amount. The bill says—such sums as may be necessary.

Five million dollars? Ten million dollars? One hundred million dollars—\$500,000,000 and more? Yes; within the provisions of this bill, for planning for post-war work activities. What will be done with the money? It will be allotted to the agencies of the United States. What agencies? Any agency, any department, any bureau, any commission, any agency of the United States. To whom else will these funds be allotted? Advances can be made to any State, to any Territory, to any island possession—everything that is within the purview and jurisdiction of the sovereignty of the United States is included in this bill. Further the bill says—

and political subdivisions thereof.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not now. Any school district can plan and get some of this money, any political division, any municipality or municipal corporation—all are included in the provisions of this bill. This money will be allotted by whom? By the President. The bill says—

under such rules and regulations as he (the President) may prescribe.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not just yet. Congress will have nothing to say about it. And for what purposes will this money be used? For surveys. Are we unmindful of the fact that we abandoned Passamaquoddy, after spending untold millions there on that fantastic scheme? That could be authorized and undertaken under the provisions of this bill. Five million dollars was invested in a hole in the ground known as the Florida ship canal, before it was licked. It recurs again now in the river and harbor bill. Any one of the countless Florida canals could be explored and money paid for it out of

this fund. Surveys? Yes. Investigation? Yes. Legal studies? Yes. Also comprehensive plans and programs. For what kind of work? Public improvements, works, and for "related activities." Mr. Speaker, "related activities" covers a multitude of sins. Every year we sit on the appropriation bill for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and every year they present to us an item called "related activities." What does it include? Malaria control, improvement in the fishing in some of the lakes and waters of the T. V. A., the operation of nurseries, instruction in the use of electricity. A thousand and one things are included in "related activities." And so I say to you today that here is an unlimited amount to be authorized without a single guide line, annually, permanently, from now on. You catch the character of this bill? It reminds me of the fellow who was in prison. A friend went by and he shouted to him. The friend said, "How long are you in there for?" and the reply was, "From now on." Yes; this is going to be from now on, for whatever amount that will be asked of the Appropriations Committee. Let me tell you something. When an authority of this kind is enacted by Congress an amount is then determined by those who shall administer the bill, and for the first time it comes to the Committee on Appropriations. Suppose they ask for a hundred million dollars, and we decide that it should be only fifty million or sixty million dollars. You know what happens. The bill comes on the floor. The committee makes its case, and then what? Those who are in favor of an unlimited amount, who are willing to take the word of the administrative agency or the President of the United States as to the amount he needs, will come in with amendments and insist on having the amount in the bill written up to the amount originally asked. Let me give you an illustration. Some years ago Congress passed the Pittman-Robertson Act to earmark the revenues from sales of ammunition and shotguns, to be used for the purposes of wildlife preservation. When the matter first came before our subcommittee we felt that probably \$1,000,000 was sufficient, although the revenues amounted to three and a half million dollars. Little by little efforts were made year after year to increase it, and finally the whole amount was taken for that purpose. That is what is going to happen here, under a permanent, annual appropriation for improvements, works, and for related activities.

Let me end where I started. Every Member of the House realizes that there must be a post-war planning program. Let them bring us a reasonable bill and give us certain guidelines, and let them indicate some of the types of work that they will explore. Let there be proper and reasonable limitations on the authority which is requested. Otherwise there will be submitted after a while a great schedule of improvements of works and related activities, and once more the Congress will be charged with the old custom of "boondoggling." So let us have some guidelines before we vote this kind of authority. My notion is that this bill ought to go back to the committee for

more careful reconsideration and for a better and more skillfully drafted bill, so that the Congress knows the limit of the authority which they propose to vote.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. EATON. I would like to ask the gentleman if the bill contains any guaranty as to how this war is going to end and also who is going to be President, if and when it ever does end?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. There is no allusion to that subject in this bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. If I read this bill correctly, legal authority is given to go out and institute condemnation proceedings and secure property under the right of eminent domain, by the authorizations which the Congress is granting?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The language includes legal studies, engineering, plans and specifications, forms of legal proceedings. What are those forms? Condemnation—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Condemnation, the taking of property. I do not know how far they will go under that language. I want to make it emphatic to the House that I recognize the necessity for a program after the war, but let Congress keep its hands on it, because it is going to be chargeable with that program, and it must assume the responsibility for it, because ultimately Congress must vote the money with which to articulate that type of program.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Illinois stated a while ago that during all the time Bruce Barton was in the House he was not able to get a single bill repealed. If he were here now, he would get one repealed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure he would. But, quite aside from that bit of levity, the point I want to make is that when you get it on the books you cannot take it off. We have put some rather amazing legislation on the books in the past few years, yet it becomes an impossible task to repeal it. Let us not make the mistake of passing a bill like this today. Let it go back for further consideration and further study, and then let them bring us a bill where the authority is reasonably well limited. The country is explosive today. It is no wonder. Let us not add to that explosive character with the enactment of a bill of this kind. We can by a decisive vote help to restore confidence in this body and in the true character of a government of divided and balanced powers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

In all charity, this bill is wholly unnecessary in the first place, and in the second place it is exceedingly unwise and without merit.

I have made inquiries. I understand there is a similar bill in the Senate and that the Senate committee conducted some hearings. I understand the House Committee on Labor conducted no hearings on this bill.

As has been suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] this bill provides for two things, for continuing and making permanent the National Resources Planning Board, with indefinite and unlimited authorizations for appropriations, the sky being the limit; and for the continuance and making permanent of the so-called State planning boards.

Well, I do not care to be unkind, but I will state in passing, as Members of the House know, the State planning boards have been the productive and fertile agencies that have generated many of the boondoggling and other fantastic projects that have been proposed or executed by W. P. A. I admit that they have recommended many good projects that would probably have been approved anyway.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Please let me proceed for the present.

Mr. FADDIS. If I could make a point of order I will get the gentleman an audience.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me proceed, if the gentleman will.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind the Members of the House who are interested in real constructive public works that the controversy embraced in this bill has been before Congress many times. While I am not authorized to speak for the Committee on Labor, I do want to say in defense of that committee that this bill and this subject matter having been disposed of by the Committee on Appropriations and by the Committee on Reorganization, and being one of the occasions for the delay in the report of that committee which refused to give it a legislative status, is now parked with the Committee on Labor. As I said in the first place, there is no necessity for this legislation. In our effort to cooperate with the Chief Executive, in the independent offices appropriation bill for the current year we appropriated for this board \$1,101,390. We placed a limitation on that bill. In all fairness, since this pending bill was introduced in May 1941, and in the current independent offices appropriation bill that we passed some days ago and which is now pending in the other body, we removed that limitation so that an appropriation has been made for the next current year in the amount of \$1,409,500 that is already available to the National Resources Planning Board.

Now, I know we have to plan for public works in the future, but when we undertake to provide for appropriations with the sky as the limit, when we undertake to make permanent and perpetuate agencies here, the so-called State planning boards, I should like to observe I speak advisedly when I say they have never

made any recommendation and have never submitted any project to Congress except to spend money. I am and have been a member of committees that have had to do with public works.

The Committee on Flood Control and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have considered projects, but the State Planning Boards for the most part have advocated the spending of money with never a thought coupled to that advocacy as to how the money was to be raised. I submit that in this bill reported by the Committee on Labor without any hearings, and without the consideration of a hearing should be defeated.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think the gentleman is quite fair.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want to be fair. If I have been unfair I ask the gentlewoman to correct me, and show wherein I am unfair.

Mrs. NORTON. The Committee on Labor reported this bill unanimously, and it was not thought necessary to hold hearings, because the Senate has held hearings on identically the same bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would not be unfair and I stated in defense of the committee that while hearings had not been held in the House they had by the Senate committee; but I stated, and the gentlewoman impliedly, at least, admits, that the theory of this bill if followed would provide for the abolition of practically every legislative committee in this body. While I have the highest regard for the Committee on Labor it has fallen to my lot many times in the past to disagree with its views even though those views may have been unanimous.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment. I want to develop the subject a little further.

While I have regard for the Committee on Labor, I do maintain that when that committee reports a measure here that has been rejected by the Committee on Reorganization, in substance, that has been rejected from time to time by a limitation on W. P. A. appropriations, relief and emergency appropriations, that was limited by the House in the annual appropriation last year, and when Congress has refused to make this National Resources Planning Board a permanent body by act of Congress, that it is unfair to the Congress for a committee to submit a bill without having conducted hearings on that bill and giving those who have opposed the theory of this legislation an opportunity to be heard. I respectfully submit with all deference that if there has been any unfairness, the unfairness is not on my part but on the part of the committee to report out such

a bill without any hearings whatsoever to justify it.

Members will recall that at the time of the passage of the Reorganization Act it was provided that the National Resources Planning Board should not supersede or perform the functions of the Corps of Army Engineers. We have the Corps of Army Engineers to do planning for us, and we have the Public Works Agency, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Reclamation. We have the Corps of Engineers having to do with flood control and rivers and harbors. Through these departments and bureaus and boards we have undertaken constructively to plan for projects that are engineeringly sound and economically justified. For my part, as a member of a legislative committee, I have never stood nor shall I ever stand for any authorization bill of any kind merely to give the Appropriations Committee an opportunity in the future to provide for those projects, and I shall continue to oppose all authorizations of all projects unless, as a member of the committee reporting the bill, I am able to say to my fellow Members in the House that they are economically justified and engineeringly and scientifically sound.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman knows, of course, that I am a member of several committees of the House. I certainly would be the last one to legislate myself out of existence as a member of a committee or legislate a committee out of existence.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Sometimes we find ourselves doing things we never intended.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman just stated that the local planning agencies are the ones that ought to initiate these projects. I have appeared before the gentleman's Committee on Flood Control and seen projects presented that had no value and seen the gentleman's committee refuse to take action on them. The same applies to this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Just a moment. Let me answer the gentleman's statement. If this bill should be passed, there would be no occasion for the legislative committees of Congress to authorize or reject or to provide other plans. The Corps of Engineers would be supplanted or duplicated.

Mr. BEITER. That is not the fact.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill would supplant the Bureau of Reclamation and it would supplant the Federal Works Agency. With all due deference, I know the gentleman's predilection for the Department of the Interior. I have no fault to find with him, but I do contend that so far as the Congress of the United States is concerned in these attempts to authorize appropriations without limit, it is time for us to stop, to look, and to listen. I am asking that there be no multiplication of the existing agencies. The gentleman's own committee, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I understand, will shortly submit to the Congress of the United States a bill to authorize not a million, not two million dollars, but prob-

ably a billion dollars' worth of projects, and the chief argument in support of that bill will be that it will provide future public works after we have passed through the existing national emergency.

I have insisted that now, instead of bringing in new employees, instead of creating new agencies, the thing for us to do in a program for all-out national defense to prosecute this war is to utilize existing Government agencies and eliminate and prevent duplication and waste.

Mr. Speaker, I trust this bill will be defeated, as it deserves to be.

POST-WAR PLANNING

I have advocated carefully planned public works to relieve unemployment and to provide for the unemployment that must follow the war. I have opposed a duplication of Government agencies that make such plans. It will be remembered that the Committee on Reorganization declined to give the National Resources Committee a legislative status. This Committee had been created by the President and had received its funds from relief and emergency acts. I have opposed much of the planning that has been done by the local and State agencies. The planning has been lopsided. Recommendations have been made for public expenditures. No consideration was given to the taxpayers. I do not recall any recommendation that any planning board made to provide the funds or the revenues for planning. I am aware that by Executive order the National Resources Committee and the Federal Employment Stabilization Board were combined into the National Resources Planning Board. The President has advised that the Board is rendering a service to the Executive. I have therefore gone along with the appropriations that have been made for the National Resources Planning Board. The amount of the appropriation for the current fiscal year of 1942 is \$1,101,390, as I have stated. The only legislative status that this Board has, as I recall, is the legislative functions conferred upon the Federal Employment Stabilization Board. As I have indicated, the independent offices appropriation bill of 1942 restricted the funds appropriated for the National Resources Planning Board to functions conferred by Congress upon the Federal Employment Stabilization Board. The limitation appearing in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1942 has been removed in the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943. The bill before us was introduced on May 29, 1941. The limitation obtained. That limitation has now been removed and the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1943 can be utilized by the Board in the planning desired by the Executive.

While post-war planning is important, it is time for Congress to put first things first. The immediate problem confronting Congress and the country is not post-war planning but is winning the war. There must be no duplication of planning agencies. The Corps of Engineers of the Army is engaged in planning flood control and river and harbor works. The Federal Power Commission is investigating national resources. The Federal

Works Agency is looking into housing and into highway needs, and has been in contact with the needs in the States. The Department of the Interior has its Bureau of Reclamation. The Department of Agriculture is investigating reforestation and soil conservation. It is time to coordinate and to correlate planning activities. It is no time to increase appropriations for planning.

It was urged during the depression that the planning board was needed to provide useful and needed public works. It was urged, when Congress was asked to appropriate more than \$1,000,000 for 1942, and to make appropriations for 1943, that now that we are at war, planning was essential to follow the war. The passage of the pending bill would not only duplicate the appropriations that have been made, but would vastly expand planning. What we need is execution. We have planned for national defense. We have planned for the Army and the Navy. We have planned for the air force. What we need now is execution by the Army, the Navy, and the air force. I am sympathetic with the solution of social problems, but we must preserve society and protect society before we reform society. We must save our country before we plan for its expansion. I repeat, it is time to put first things first.

The Army, Navy, and allied departments must be expanded just as many departments were expanded to provide for the depression. One of these was the National Resources Planning Board and its predecessor, the National Resources Committee. It is time to reduce agencies of the Government that are not directly related to national defense. Instead of bringing in new employees for the defense agencies, there should be a reduction in nondefense expenditures, and nondefense agencies and employees who are trained should be transferred to defense agencies. There must not only be a reduction, but many agencies of the depression are now superfluous. The work of the National Youth Administration can be done by the Office of Education.

The C. C. C. has served its purpose. There is much duplication. I am told that many agencies are engaged in defense housing. There is no occasion for duplication in planning.

As I have indicated, the National Resources Committee was appropriated for in the Relief and Emergency Acts up to and including the year 1939. There was a limitation upon the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board, as I recall, in the appropriations for 1941 and 1942. I repeat to emphasize that the limitation for the fiscal year 1943 has been removed, and the bill as it passed the House increased the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board from \$1,101,390 to \$1,409,550.

I repeat that the pending bill was introduced on May 29, 1941. We have increased the current appropriation for the next fiscal year at a time when the nondefense expenditures should be reduced by \$300,000, and yet this agency is urging Congress to pass the pending bill that will give it for the first time, through the back door, a legislative status and will provide for its perpetuation with the

sky as the limit on its appropriations. Moreover, it will provide for making permanent provision for State planning boards at a time when the States should recognize the burden that is on the American taxpayers, and reduce local expenditures inasmuch as the Federal Government is taxing them until it hurts and to the bone.

It is time for the elimination of duplication. There are established planning agencies of the Government to which I have referred, and there are others. There is no occasion for them to be duplicated. It not only is not time for expansion, but it is time for reduction. It is time to go right down the line to eliminate duplication, to provide for the merging from nondefense to defense activities, to coordinate the agencies of the Government, and to convert and reduce rather than expand nondefense activities.

I repeat that I have supported the President. I have yielded against my better judgment, and we voted substantially \$1,500,000 to give the President the benefit of the Planning Board that he has established. We have gone far enough. I conclude as I began. There is no need therefore for the pending bill. The National Resources Planning Board is being provided for. It has the largest appropriation it has ever received for the next fiscal year. It is time to call a halt in expansion. It is time to reduce and not to expand governmental agencies.

The United States, with defeats of its Army and defeats of its Navy, with the most crushing defeats ever sustained by the Army and the Navy, is face to face with the gravest danger in its history. The supreme problem confronting our country is not so much planning for its future as it is protecting, defending, and preserving the Republic.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership of the House may be aware of what is going on and not get into another very embarrassing situation, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. FADDIS. I withhold it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made previously today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my point of order.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order has been made that must be disposed of before anyone else may be recognized. The Chair will count. [After

counting.] One hundred and sixty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Arnold	Jensen	Schaefer, Ill.
Baldwin	Johnson	Short
Buckley, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Simpson
Butler	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Pa.
Byron	Kieberg	Smith, W. Va.
Ciuett	Kramer	Sparkman
Cole, Md.	Lea	Stratton
Cole, N. Y.	Leavy	Summers, Tex.
Crawford	McGregor	Sweeney
Culkin	McKeough	Taber
Elliott, Mass.	Magnuson	Tolan
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gathings	Mitchell	Vreeland
Gibson	Monroney	Wadsworth
Gillette	O'Day	Walter
Hancock	Oliver	Weaver
Harness	Osmer	Weiss
Hendricks	Rizley	Wilson
Jarrett	Romjue	Wolfenden, Pa.
Jenks, N. H.	Sacks	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a great deal of misapprehension and many ridiculous misstatements regarding the bill before the House today. I am quite amazed at some of the statements that have been made here. They certainly do not bear out the facts. The purpose of this bill was recommended by the President of the United States contained in his two messages to the Congress and is designed to carry out his recommendations. It was following these recommendations that the Committee on Labor considered the bill of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER], who has made quite a study of this whole matter. We did not hold hearings on the bill for the simple reason that the Senate held hearings and copies of those hearings are available to every Member of the House.

I may say that, as far as I know, not a single objection was entered to the bill from anybody. This, I think, is something that cannot be said about many bills. On the contrary, we have had letters of endorsement from practically everybody concerned with this type of legislation. I am going to call the names of just a few of them.

The Department of Agriculture; the Department of Labor; the Federal Works Agency; the War Department, which endorsed it most heartily; and the Bureau of the Budget, and I think you will all agree with me that the Bureau of the Budget scans a bill pretty closely before it endorses it.

Many of the civil agencies of the country have endorsed the bill. The Secretary of the Interior and, mark this, all the labor organizations of the country and many municipal governments have endorsed the bill. All of these representatives appeared before the Senate Committee on Labor when it was considering a companion bill to this. Also the Association of General Contractors and

a long list of others too numerous to mention in the short time I have at my disposal, all appeared in favor of the bill.

This bill simply provides authorization for the President to suggest ways and means to make surveys and investigations of necessary public works and to allot such funds as are necessary to prepare plans for such public works after we have won the war. Is there anything strange or peculiar about that? Let me say to you that if plans had been made 2 or 3 years ago, as was suggested by the President in his frequent messages to Congress, we would not be in the unhappy condition we are in today in this war effort, but did many Members pay much attention to the suggestions that were made then by the President? They did not. I recall Members coming down to the Well of this House and calling the President a warmonger because he wanted authority to prepare for what he knew and what every other person who had any sense should have known was coming to this country.

Now we are attempting to prepare plans to stabilize economic conditions when peace has been declared, and I hope and pray God that may not be too long.

Is there anything strange about planning for the post-war effort when we know that business is undergoing a great change even now, and will certainly require all the wisdom and planning possible to sustain the country when the war is over? Is it not a fact that the termination of the war will be the wrong time to attempt such planning? Does it not seem just plain common sense to prepare for the dislocation of our economy when our war effort is concluded and peace is established?

I am perfectly amazed at some of the statements I have heard here today about funds. Do you not trust your President? I ask the Members on this side of the House, Do you not trust the President of the United States? Do you think he would be instrumental in providing funds or suggesting plans for anything that was not absolutely necessary? All we give him in this bill is an authorization to use the facilities of the Government to make legal studies, plans, and programs necessary to facilitate and expedite post-war planning. As to funds, you know that before funds are allocated the Appropriations Committee would have the last word, and a bill of particulars concerning the projects designated would come before Congress for action.

Had a public-works program been provided for in the never-to-be-forgotten days of 1930, 1931, and 1932, with its appalling dislocation of our economic structure, the history of that period would have been different. The same shortsightedness was apparent then as is evident here today. The same lack of vision is responsible for the delay in preparing for war. Certainly we were adequately warned by the President, the Secretary of State, and others responsible for our Government, but until Pearl Harbor those warnings were disregarded by many of the same gentlemen who are now opposing this bill. When shall we learn our lesson and plan for emergencies before they arise? The gentlemen who are opposing this bill today must be prepared

to answer to the country when, a few years from now, we shall find ourselves seeking a solution to a problem which thinking people know will arise.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if objection is heard, I move the previous question on the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have an amendment at the desk that I should like to have considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey has moved the previous question, and the Chair must put the question.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 37, noes 120.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 252, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—104

Barry	Green	O'Leary
Beam	Harrington	O'Toole
Beiter	Hart	Patrick
Bloom	Hartley	Peterson, Fla.
Boland	Heffernan	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Hill, Wash.	Ramsay
Burdick	Hook	Ramspeck
Burgin	Houston	Randolph
Byron	Hunter	Rankin, Miss.
Canfield	Imhoff	Rivers
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Rogers, Okla.
Capozzoli	Jackson	Sabath
Casey, Mass.	Jacobsen	Sacks
Celler	Kee	Scanlon
Claypool	Kelley, Pa.	Schuetz
Coffee, Wash.	Kelly, Ill.	Schulte
Cooley	Kirwan	Sheridan
Crosser	Klein	Smith, Pa.
Cullen	Kopplemann	Smith, Wash.
Cunningham	Lane	Snyder
D'Alesandro	Larrabee	Spence
Day	Lea	Sullivan
Dickstein	Leavy	Sutphin
Dingell	Lesinski	Sweeney
Downs	Lynch	Tenerowicz
Ellis	Maclejewski	Terry
Fitzgerald	MacIara	Thom
Fitzpatrick	Marcantonio	Traynor
Flaherty	Merritt	Vincent, Ky.
Fogarty	Murdock	Welch
Folger	Myers, Pa.	Wene
Forand	Nichols	Wickersham
Ford, Thomas F.	Norton	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavagan	O'Brien, Mich.	Young
Gore	O'Connor	

NAYS—252

Allen, Ill.	Gamble	O'Neal
Allen, La.	Gathings	Pace
Andersen,	Gearhart	Paddock
H. Carl	Gehrmann	Patman
Anderson, Calif.	Gerlach	Patton
Anderson,	Gifford	Pearson
N. Mex.	Gilchrist	Peterson, Ga.
Andresen,	Gillie	Pheiffer,
August H.	Gossett	William T.
Andrews	Graham	Pierce
Angell	Grant, Ala.	Plauché
Arends	Grant, Ind.	Ploeser
Barden	Gregory	Plumley
Barnes	Guyer	Poage
Bates, Ky.	Gwynne	Powers
Bates, Mass.	Haines	Priest
Baumhart	Hall	Rankin, Mont.
Beckworth	Edwin Arthur	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Hall	Reed, Ill.
Bender	Leonard W.	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett	Halleck	Rees, Kans.
Bishop	Hancock	Rich
Blackney	Harris, Ark.	Richards
Bland	Harris, Va.	Rizley
Boehne	Hébert	Robertson,
Boggs	Heidinger	N. Dak.
Bolton	Hess	Robertson, Va.
Boren	Hill, Colo.	Robson, Ky.
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Rockefeller
Brooks	Hobbs	Rockwell
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Holbrook	Rogers, Mass.
Bryson	Holmes	Rolph
Buck	Hope	Russell
Bulwinkle	Howell	Sanders
Burch	Hull	Sasscer
Camp	Jarman	Scott
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins, Ohio	Scrugham
Carlson	Jenks, N. H.	Secrest
Carter	Jennings	Shafer, Mich.
Cartwright	Johns	Shanley
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Shannon
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Sikes
Chipperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson
Clevenger	Johnson,	Smith, Maine
Cluett	Luther A.	Smith, Ohio
Cochran	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Va.
Coffee, Nebr.	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Collins	Jonkman	South
Colmer	Kean	Springer
Cooper	Keefe	Starnes, Ala.
Copeland	Kefauver	Steagall
Costello	Kerr	Stearns, N. H.
Courtney	Kilburn	Stefan
Cox	Kilday	Stevenson
Cravens	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Creal	Knutsen	Summers, Tex.
Crowther	Kociakowski	Talbot
Curtis	Kunkel	Talle
Davis, Ohio	Landis	Tarver
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Thill
Dewey	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Lewis	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	McGehee	Thomason
Disney	McIntyre	Tibbott
Ditter	McLaughlin	Tinkham
Domengeaux	McLean	Van Zandt
Dondero	McMillan	Vinson, Ga.
Doughton	Maas	Vorys, Ohio
Douglas	Mahon	Ward
Drewry	Manasco	Wastelewski
Durham	Mansfield	Weaver
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	West
Eaton	Mason	Wheat
Eberharter	May	Whelchel
Edmiston	Meyer, Md.	White
Elliott, Calif.	Michener	Whitten
Elston	Mills, Ark.	Whittington
Engel	Mills, La.	Wigglesworth
Faddis	Moser	Williams
Fellows	Mott	Winter
Fenton	Mundt	Wolcott
Fish	Murray	Woodrum, Va.
Flannagan	Nelson	Wright
Ford, Leland M.	Norrell	Youngdahl
Ford, Miss.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Fulmer	O'Hara	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Case, S. Dak.

NOT VOTING—74

Arnold	Crawford	Harter
Baldwin	Culkin	Healey
Bonner	Delaney	Hendricks
Boykin	Duncan	Jarrett
Buckler, Minn.	Eliot, Mass.	Jensen
Buckley, N. Y.	Englebright	Johnson,
Butler	Gale	Lyndon B.
Byrne	Gibson	Johnson, Okla.
Clark	Gillette	Kennedy
Clason	Granger	Martin J.
Cole, Md.	Hare	Kennedy
Cole, N. Y.	Harness	Michael J.

Keogh	Oliver	Sparkman
Kleberg	Osmers	Stratton
Kramer	Pfeifer	Taber
Lambertson	Joseph L.	Tolan
Ludlow	Pittenger	Treadway
McCormack	Robinson, Utah	Voorhis, Calif.
McGranery	Romjue	Vreeland
McGregor	Satterfield	Wadsworth
McKeough	Sauthoff	Walter
Magnuson	Schaefer, Ill.	Wilson
Martin, Mass.	Sheppard	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mitchell	Short	Woodruff, Mich.
Monroney	Smith, W. Va.	Worley
O'Day	Somers, N. Y.	Weiss

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Elliot of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Crawford against.

Mr. McKeough for, with Mr. Gibson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Culin.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Pittenger.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Butler.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Granger with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Duncan with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Harter with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Englebright.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Arnold with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Sauthoff.

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Byrne.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Voorhis of California.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. McGanery with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Healey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks briefly at this point on the amendment which I had proposed to offer to the bill considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, objections to the bill, H. R. 5638, center on two propositions: First, the fact there is no limit to the amount of appropriations authorized; second, the fact that as the bill was drawn, the language would permit a duplication of staffs and surveys with those of the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation. It is my opinion that both of those de-

fects could be corrected by appropriate amendment. That is why I sought recognition and regretted that the chairman of the committee moved the previous question on passage of the bill.

The first objection could have been met by a simple amendment placing a limit on the amount that might be appropriated under the act.

The second could have been met by changing the phrase "making of such examinations, surveys, and so forth" to "coordinating of such examination, surveys, and so forth, as are authorized by law." I feel that would have made certain the accomplishment of the fundamental purpose or intent of such legislation.

That intent or purpose was stated clearly by the Congress in 1931. In enacting the Employment Stabilization Act, of which this bill would have become a part, the Congress, in 1931, declared it—to be the policy of Congress to arrange the construction of public works so far as practicable in such manner as will assist in the stabilization of industry and employment through the proper timing of such construction, and that to further this object there shall be advance planning, including preparation of detailed construction plans, of public works (sec. 8 (a) of the act).

Our immediate objective is to win the war. Winning the war involves construction of certain facilities in every part of the country. I see no objection to having somebody coordinate that construction and eliminate overlapping and possible waste whenever it can be done without serious delay. What we do now also should be done with a view to salvage and greatest possible use in the post-war period, where it can be done without delaying the job in hand. Winning the war involves winning the desired kind of a post-war world.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to get recognition upon the legislation just rejected by the House in order that I might express my views on it. Never, since I have been a Member of this body, have I seen a piece of legislation more justly receive the fate it so richly merited. Not because those of us who opposed it are not aware that post-war planning is necessary. I am firmly convinced that every Member of the House realizes that post-war planning is necessary, and I am of the opinion that every Member of the House is in favor of such legislation. I most emphatically am in favor of such legislation.

Nevertheless, in passing such legislation we must be reasonable. We must not place our stamp of approval on such ill-conceived legislation as that just before the House, which the chairwoman of the Committee on Labor admits was reported out of her committee without a hearing. Under the terms of this legislation the Congress would have surrendered, as far as any action by legislative committees was concerned, all powers to regulate, direct, or control any public works of any kind unless section

9 of the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 is either repealed or amended. You all know how difficult it is to repeal any legislation.

This legislation gave the freedom of the seas to any board or boards of visionary, impractical, star-gazing planners to work in any or all of their rattle-brained ideas in regard to post-war planning. Of course, those who supported this legislation said no appropriation was provided for. That was true, but it authorized unlimited appropriations.

Under the terms of this legislation, the St. Lawrence waterway project, the Florida ship canal, the Passamaquoddy project, or any number of various other projects now in the minds of the many impractical dreamers still at large could have been well started. The taxpayers, if any are left after the war, would have been handed the bill. The possibilities of the bill are too numerous to be enumerated. It was dangerous to the extreme.

Well, this House, which a few days ago expressed its disapproval of fan dancers during the war, turned thumbs down on the possibility of any such after the war. We want none of them, and neither does the Nation.

There seems to be a great stir of planning for after the war by a set which in many cases is only interested in creating soft jobs for their own set in places where they will be safe from the draft. My opinion is that the men who fight this war and those who have fought other wars, the men who have faced the real danger and hardship and who have made the real sacrifices, those who have given something of themselves to preserve the Nation, are going to have quite a voice in the post-war period of this Nation. My advice to the people of the Nation would be that at least part of the planning for the post-war period be left for those who are going to provide for the post-war security of the United States of America. I have a feeling that these men are going to demand a more practical solution of many of our national affairs than has heretofore been evidenced. More national and less class planning. More breaks for the United States and less catering to organized pressure groups.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. Celler asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some editorial comment on the recent death of Charles Brooks Smith, correspondent for a number of newspapers in West Virginia and for 30 years a member of the House and Senate Press Galleries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program and any previous special order on next Tuesday, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill, under consideration today, was rejected and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the legislative program on Tuesday next, and following any previous special order I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a statement I made before the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR PLANNING BY AMENDING STABILIZATION ACT OF 1931

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand why anyone should oppose this bill—a bill which provides for the alleviation of post-war conditions which are bound to come about through the dislocation in our social, economic, and industrial lives.

Most of us can remember vividly the events following the last war. We recall vividly and surely the terrible condition of the country and of its people following 1929. In order to avoid a repetition following the present war—and a repetition is inevitable—some legislation is necessary by the National Congress. We realize that the Government cannot do everything, but the things it cannot do it can sponsor and lend encouragement.

In addition to this, there is no greater factor which would serve to improve the morale of the American people. Then they would know that the Congress is thinking of their welfare for the post-war period. There is much fear among the people as to what will follow the present war. I know that it would aid the people in stiffening their courage and raising their spirits, and if for no other reason this bill should be passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an editorial from the Duluth News-Tribune endorsing the idea of a national drawing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

RELIEF FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN DECEASED CIVILIANS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am inclined to believe that if the Government of the United States had anticipated that the Japanese attack was to occur as soon as it did, or anticipated it at all, that it would have caused the removal from the Pacific islands of Wake and Guam of the civilians who were there doing work for the Government in time to have them reach home before the catastrophe. Consequently I am introducing a bill providing that the Secretary of the Navy compensate the dependents of those people while they are incarcerated, and the heirs of those who have perished, at least until the end of the war, in amounts equal to two-thirds the monthly salaries or wages they were receiving on December 7, 1941. I hope this bill will receive the consideration of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as I am certain that the bill can be improved by that committee, and that early action will be taken by that committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a statement of the Louisiana Farm Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the subject It Is Time To Ration Pork.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter from a very fine young woman in Kansas who wants to join the Woman's Corps. It is typical of the letters that I am receiving.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a column by Frank Kent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a statement with reference to pensions which he has made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

and include an address I delivered last Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a brief article from the Boston Traveler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Hawarden Independent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may have authority to sign the enrolled bill H. R. 6548, the deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein some newspaper articles and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th, from the Well of this House, the gentleman from northern Michigan [Mr. Hook], referring to the Member from the Fourth Michigan District, said:

I say to him there has been no strike in defense industries and there are no strikes today.

That was said on the 17th. I will read it again:

There has been no strike in defense industries and there are no strikes today.

Now, when that kind of a statement is made on the floor of the House, we cannot let it go unchallenged, because it is not accurate.

No; the gentleman was speaking on the 17th; that is, last Tuesday. The Washington Post of the 18th carried this headline: "Strike again closes Alcoa's Detroit plant; welders walk out on ship jobs at Mobile."

A part of the news story sent out by accurate and factual Associated Press reads as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 18, 1942]

STRIKE AGAIN CLOSES ALCOA'S DETROIT PLANT—WELDERS WALK OUT ON SHIP JOBS AT MOBILE

DETROIT, February 17.—A second strike within 72 hours today closed the Detroit plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, which manufactures parts for airplane-engine factories and other defense industries.

An estimated 800 employees on the day shift walked out, many of the strikers forming picket lines around the plant.

Victor C. Swearingen, State labor conciliator, said today's strike occurred when union officials informed employees of details of a conference with the plant management. Negotiations were resumed after the walk-out.

Six hundred night-shift employees walked out of the plant Saturday during negotiation of a new bargaining contract, but resumed work Monday.

Union officials said neither strike was authorized.

MOBILE WELDERS STRIKE

MOBILE, ALA., February 17.—Operations at the Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation's shipyard at nearby Chickasaw were curtailed today when welders stayed away from their jobs in protest against union requirements.

This action came a few hours after welders at Tacoma, Wash., had ended a lengthy walk-out brought on by a similar dispute.

Fred Huddleston, secretary-treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Welders, Cutters, and Helpers, an independent union, said approximately 800 men were involved.

A spokesman for the welders said "the men have quit their jobs as a protest against requirements they carry membership cards in the American Federation of Labor." The management made no statement.

The Chickasaw plant is one of the largest shipyards in the Gulf area.

TWO-DAY STRIKE ENDS

DETROIT, February 17.—Striking employees of the Detroit Nut Co., heeding the urging of a United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.) official, decided today to end their 2-day strike and leave their dispute for future settlement negotiations.

Although the company employs only about 60 workers, some gigantic defense industries were said to be dependent on it for parts.

The gentleman from Michigan should not be criticized because he did not know, when he was speaking on the 17th, that that same day a second strike within 72 hours had closed the Detroit plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, and it may be that he should not have known of the first strike which closed that plant so recently.

Likewise, too, let us be charitable and say that he was not charged with knowledge of the strike at the Detroit Nut Co. which the A. P. reported on the 17th.

Likewise, he may be excused for not having learned, through the A. P. dispatch of the 17th, of the strike at the Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, near Mobile, Ala. However, it does seem as though he might have had knowledge of the strike at the Aluminum Co.'s plant in Detroit, which ended on the 16th.

An A. P. dispatch headlined Detroit and dated the 16th carried the following:

**NONSTRIKING WORKMAN IS BEATEN, DIES—
DETROIT WALK-OUT ENDS AFTER VIOLENCE
RESULTS IN ONE FATALITY**

DETROIT, February 16.—Normal working operations were resumed this morning at the Aluminum Co. of America plant here, scene Saturday evening of a walk-out, during which an employee was fatally injured.

Anton Wisniewski, 36, of 4080 Sugar Bush Road, Mount Clemens, worker in the plant's core department, was knocked down when he hesitated to join in the walk-out at 7 p. m. Saturday. He died in a hospital Sunday from the effects of a head injury.

Police held Chester Chojnacki, 31, of Hamtramck, who was quoted by Assistant Prosecutor Richard Lamb as saying, "I told him (Wisniewski) to quit work and come along with us. He left his work and started pushing me, saying, 'I don't know whether I want to leave or not.'"

HIT HIM ONCE

"I resented his pushing and hit him once in the face. He fell down and hit his head on the concrete floor."

Frank Wilkinson, vice president of Local 11, Aluminum Workers of America (Congress of

Industrial Organizations), said the walk-out was unauthorized by union leaders and apparently resulted from "an accumulation of unsettled grievances" while a new contract was under negotiation. He said the walk-out involved about 600 workers on the afternoon shift.

The plant, described by a State labor conciliator as "one of the most important defense plants in the area," manufactures aluminum parts for airplane motors and other war needs.

Wisniewski, his wife, and their two small children came to the Detroit area a year ago from a farm near Dodge, Nebr.

But let us concede that the gentleman, when he stated on the 17th that there were no strikes today, may have been unaware of some of the strikes which are taking place throughout our country.

The Detroit Free Press of the 12th contained the following news story, with reference to strikes at Ford plants:

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 12, 1942]

**WORK HALTED ANEW AT THREE FORD UNITS—
PETTY DISPUTE HITS VITAL BOMBER TOOLS**

As the Pacific defenses of the United Nations tottered Wednesday night, two entire buildings and part of another at the Ford plants were darkened by a work stoppage.

The disruption of operations was one of a series which started Sunday. Men who reported for the 6 p. m. shift Wednesday told the Free Press that they worked 1 hour, then were turned away through the influence of "irresponsible leaders."

The buildings closed or partially closed were those which house the tool and die department, the pressed-steel department, and tool department of the rolling mill.

THOMAS ISSUES WORK PLEA

Informed that the controversy was continuing, President R. J. Thomas, of the United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations), issued an appeal to all Ford workers to report on their regular shifts and remain on the job.

Richard T. Leonard, director of the Ford division of the United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations), was reported returning to Detroit from Washington to take charge of the situation.

Earlier Wednesday 10,000 Ford workers, all of whom are engaged in vital defense industry, had been made idle through walk-outs in the tool and die departments.

A high-ranking Army officer sent a full report of the fiasco to the War Department and acidly announced:

"With men 'ying because of our lack of aircraft, it is an outrage that tools being prepared for the bomber plant (Ford Willow Run plant) should be crippled in this manner by such a trivial thing."

The dispute first started Sunday night in the new tool and die plant which is engaged in producing vital tools for the bomber plant, where about 2,000 men are employed.

Horace Merrill, described as a former American Federation of Labor steward, was the central figure in the dispute. He was said to have engaged in an argument.

Most of the other employees of the department demanded that the Ford Co. fire Merrill. They carried this demand to the United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations) shop committee.

A company spokesman said that he had refused to dismiss Merrill because he had been a good workman and could take a case against the company to the National Labor Relations Board if he were fired.

"The union has the best out in the world," he said. "They can dismiss this man from the union and we would have to take him off our pay roll, because we have a union-shop agreement with the union."

FIFTY THOUSAND MAN-HOURS

He estimated that 50,000 man-work-hours had been lost because of the shut-down.

So you will see that the gentleman was completely mistaken when he made the unequivocal statement that there has been no strike in defense industries.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHITE. What is the solution of the gentleman's problem?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The adoption of the Smith amendments by the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. That is all that is needed?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is one thing needed. That will do for a starter.

Now, today, down before the President's War Labor Board, negotiations are pending, growing out of a strike which did not appear in the newspapers, at Syracuse, N. Y. The Doyle Machine Co.'s plant, doing war work for an airplane construction company, was closed not long ago. On a Monday morning the strikers sat down in that plant. That is, they employed the old fashioned sit-down strike. And three successive shifts sat down. They continued to sit down until Tuesday and thereafter the strike ran along until Friday night in the usual way.

The demand of the union was for increased wages and a closed shop. The workers came in that day on Monday—let me pause there to say that the request shows that these Detroit strikes were not authorized by the union. They were wild-cat strikes. Nevertheless they occurred. Wild-cat strikes can close factories just as effectively as an authorized strike.

Now, going back to this Syracuse strike: These men in the Syracuse plant walked in and presented their demand for a closed shop and said, "You grant it or we will sit down," and they did. Then what happened? As I said, the strike ran along until Friday night. Then the War Board, this creature of the President, called the company officials down to Washington. And they are down here today. What is occurring? What is happening? This is what happens. That War Board, in substance, is telling these company officials that they will agree to the closed shop or take the consequences. Now, how do you like it?

And please keep this in mind—that these workers at the Syracuse plant, engaged in war work, struck in violation of their written pledge, made a week after war was declared, that they would cooperate 100 percent with the Government's war efforts. They sent a copy of that pledge to Mr. Knudsen. Nevertheless, despite their pledge, they went on a sit-down strike, and they now insist that only members of their union shall work in that shop in defense of our country.

Now, over in the other body, on the 13th, it was said this was not a Democratic war nor a Republican war. Here, the day before yesterday, we heard the majority leader tell us that this was not a Republican war and it was not a Democratic war. We heard the majority leader tell us that everyone had a card in the Union of the United States. But the dif-

faculty is that that card which we have in the Union of the United States does not admit us through the gates that these unions have erected around defense jobs. You have to buy another card. You have to buy a license. You can go into the Army or the Navy whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. Politics apparently does not cut so much figure when you want a defense job, but you do have to join a union.

These men from that plant—and I hope the War Board gets it—are down here, and they are threatened—indirectly, of course—with penalties unless they give this union a closed shop. To put it differently, that card which you and I have in the Union of the United States does not work, is not recognized, according to this War Board, in this plant up at Syracuse.

Now, that strike was presumably settled. I mean, the differences were presumably adjusted, and some of these men were going home. But one of the members of the Board said, "No; you had better stay."

This is not anything new; not at all. I call your attention to the old days of the Allis-Chalmers strike, long, long ago. They were making turbines. Failure to deliver the machinery which the Government needed at a battery plant out in Virginia was holding up construction of that plant. The Allis-Chalmers people were called down here and kept here, I think it was, for almost 3 weeks while this administration's Board tried to drive it into a closed shop at the demand of Christoffer, who is a Communist and whose wife is a Communist and has a card and who held a Government job in the Department of Agriculture at \$1,450 a year.

My only purpose in the beginning was to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] unintentionally, no doubt, made that misstatement. I do not understand just why it is or how it came about that he did not know we had strikes in defense industries in this country. I cannot understand that.

My further purpose was to call attention again to the fact that just a few days ago on that large appropriation bill we had up here the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] offered an amendment embodying the provisions of the bill we adopted in the House by a vote of more than 2 to 1 and sent to the other body, yet on that amendment we mustered only 39 votes. The bill was for \$32,000,000,000 for national defense. Then when a Member comes along with an amendment which would enable us to spend that money efficiently and get something for our \$32,000,000,000, we just lack the courage to stand up against these labor lobbyists and put it through.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Did the gentleman read about the fishermen on the Atlantic coast and the payment of insurance before they would go to sea? How they came before the War Labor Board here and forced the owners to arbitrate—a small union in the city of Boston? And did the gentleman read the indictment

they placed upon those owners, how they smeared them?

I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that one of the toughest things I have ever done was to dictate a letter of criticism to the War Labor Board last Saturday criticizing them for their narrowness of decision:

We will arbitrate that one question and we will not consider anything else.

The owners asked if they would help them arbitrate the next demand the unions were going to make, and their reply was that they would rule simply on one little narrow point. God help the employer in every instance these days, as I see it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The situation has been the same for a long, long time. I did not happen to read the articles to which the gentleman referred, but I know what has happened down here from the record they make; that every month the administration's agencies have been forcing the employers, if they wanted to get these Government contracts and if they wanted to go ahead on the contracts after they got them, have forced them to accept the closed shop.

What I cannot understand is when they take men into the Army and Navy without any such qualification, when they compel them to go in; yet, if you want to work to give support to the men who have gone to war, you have to buy a license and pay tribute to a private organization. I cannot understand that.

Mr. GIFFORD. The terrible part, I want to say to the gentleman, is my worry over whether or not I may have made an unpatriotic gesture in trying to defend American employers. After I wrote the letter I received word that the owners of the fishing vessels had capitulated. They were given no protection. They were besmeared. The gentleman must have read about how they smeared them and said: "You are the only one out of 80 cases who resisted our decision." I appeal to this House: Was I unpatriotic in criticizing that Board? Somehow I feel guilty. What should I do?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I got such information as I have here about this situation down here but I did not get it from the employers. I have tried to get that kind of information from employers but they and their representatives always say: "No; we cannot give it to you." I asked: "Why?" "Well, because if we do the Board will crack down on us." That is the degree of fright they have; they are afraid. They dare not come to their Representatives. I am sure that many a Member on the floor of this House has had manufacturers from his district that he would like to help tell him: "Don't you say anything, you are a Republican," or, "You are opposed to the administration. Don't you say anything or we will lose the contract, we will not get it."

Do you remember when John Lewis, during the soft-coal strike was demanding a closed shop? The President said the Government would never force a man into a union, that it would be too much like Hitler; yet within 15 days the board of arbitration down here—you remember—Steelman, and those two others—they forced those miners into the closed shop.

There is no use in talking to the administration. It is hopeless; so are these boards. They have sold themselves out body and soul. Their acts demonstrate that this administration does not care as much about winning this war or about national defense—and while I am speaking extemporaneously I have full possession of my mental faculties and I know what I am talking about, and I weigh my words—I say it does not care as much about winning this war and preparing for national defense as it does about keeping the good will of the labor leaders, or that it is cowardly and will not stand up to its work.

What I am asking, all that I am asking of the minority Members, is that we get together and present a united front and see if there are not enough men over on the majority side to compel that other body to consider the legislation we send them. We cannot control their vote, but we should be able to blast them out of that sit-down strike they are in and compel them to stand up and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a resolution on the continuance of the N. Y. A. school program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FALSE PHILOSOPHY

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this country is at war. This is not an ordinary war, of the ordinary concept, but it is a war of organization and correlation such as the world has never known before. The past 2 years have certainly shown this, and particularly have the past 2 months shown something with reference to the war efforts of Japan. Up to a short time ago many in this country were inclined to sneer at Japan and to underestimate their strength, but it is now apparent that they have a well-organized, well-correlated, and well-coordinated war machine.

A war machine of this nature is not accidental, but has a well-organized movement of government behind it to accelerate and perfect its plans and put them into action. The United States of America certainly has all the things and more that any of these Axis countries have had at their demand to build a far better, far mightier, and far more powerful military machine than these people ever dreamed of having. We can truthfully say that we have better technicians, better facilities for production, better outlets to raw materials and all materials than any of these people ever have had. On the other hand, all these things are not going to do us any good or be of any avail to us if they are not immediately taken advantage of and used effectively to build the greatest military and naval machine that the world has ever known.

It is with this idea in mind that I am speaking today, and am going to make

some suggestions and constructive criticisms.

At the very outset, I want to say that I am going to do everything in my power to uphold the hands of the President of the United States and all of its officers in building such a machine, in order to win this war, to maintain American liberty and the American form of government. I have voted with the administration on every single one of its defense items and on all items of its foreign policy, and what I have to say is in a spirit of helpfulness, and I hope it will be accepted in that spirit, and, further than that, I hope attention will be paid to it.

I realize that during this terrible time of stress the President of the United States has many, many things to do and many things to consider, all in connection with affairs of state, consultations with his admirals and his generals, not only of our own country but in an effort to organize with those of our Allies so that we may have a unified program. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that there are many things that cannot be brought to the President's personal attention, and that many things are done without his knowledge, and that he cannot organize every single detail in connection with the winning of this war. Therefore, I think it necessary to bring to the attention of the administration that things are not moving along in our war program as efficiently as they should; that there is great lack of organization all along the line and that this organization should immediately be changed, particularly here in Washington, so that this war effort can be speeded up and the wheels of production move in such a way that we will not be too late.

I am not motivated alone by my own concept of this, but judging from the correspondence of my thousands of constituents they feel the same as I do. Many in our own House, on both sides, feel that way.

When considering these things I cannot help but think of some of the happenings of the past, and the mistakes of the past. I do not want to rehash the happenings of the past, except in those instances in which these mistakes are being perpetuated and which will affect us now and in the future. Where a thing is wrong it should be corrected, and not perpetuated.

I cannot help but recall the false philosophy that was preached to our country by groups who are still in our Government and continuing to preach that false philosophy and use their mistaken judgments. We had the false philosophy of scarcity, wherein we were told that we had too much production; that individuals were producing too much with machines; we had too many machines, too many men, too much material, too much agricultural production, too much work and not enough play. Efficiency and thrift were discredited. These false philosophers made a very vicious and effective attack upon business and industry. In agriculture, for instance, they wanted to plow under every other row, suggested killing the pigs, and, in fact, put forth a program that slowed down production. Now we have a shortage.

The net result of this false philosophy was, unfortunately, that it did become effective. American industry and business, both big and small—and, do not forget, 80 percent of business and industry is made up of so-called small business—was slowed down, efficiency lowered, and, in short, the very high efficiency that we now need has to be rebuilt.

These false philosophers, unfortunately, have too well accomplished their program, and have proven they were mistaken, because in this hour of trial and need we now have to turn to the industrial and business interests they would have destroyed to save us in this war.

While I am interested in the past bad judgment of these false philosophers, I am more interested in what is going to happen to us in the future. Therefore I am concerned to find every single one of these false philosophers, with their bad judgment, still sitting in high places, still trying to run this Government, still without understanding of the first principles of organization whatsoever.

The answer to that is that they must be moved out and discharged and competent, efficient organizers succeed them in this country if it is going to win the war. The record shows that the ideas and philosophy of this group was to create more jobs, whether they were needed or not, just so long as they were jobs, and the net result of that has been to injure the country in its defense program by reason of using up its capital and credit. These false philosophers not only preached the philosophy of not too much work, not too much production, but also preached a philosophy that everybody should play, that there should be many hours of recreation, and nobody should work very hard. The idea of saving and thrift was intolerable to them.

The old concept that American people individually should stand on their own feet, as we have always done as a strong nation, was thrown aside. Paternalism, collectivism, socialism, and many other "isms" have crept into power with these people.

You cannot have a government half socialistic, paternalistic, or communistic, and half democracy. These types of government will not mix any more than gasoline and water will mix. We must have one or the other, and it is my belief that the great majority of our people want the American form of government. The gasoline of paternalism, collectivism, and socialism will not work in the carburetor of democracy any more than water will work in the carburetor designed for gasoline.

These experiments may be carried on, disastrous and expensive as they were and are, in times of peace, but they are absolutely intolerable in times of crisis and war. Therefore, I again make the suggestion that a thorough housecleaning be had right here in Washington, in the Government itself. My prediction is this, that unless this housecleaning is thoroughly done, and done soon, this country may lose the war.

I concur in the President's statement that we cannot have business as usual; also, in his statement that the American life cannot go on as usual; that we will

have to make certain personal sacrifices that are going to inconvenience us all. The great bulk of the American people are as a unit in obeying these requests, but at the same time they resent—and in my opinion, justly so—the statement that all these social gains that were preached by the false philosophers above referred to must go on. Without doubt or question, there have been many dangerous experiments made affecting the financial soundness of this country, which, in turn, is one of our greatest factors of defense. This experimentation will certainly have to cease during this time of war, and these philosophers, in my opinion, will have to lay aside some of their ideas of social gains which to many of us appear to be socialistic gains and do without that pleasure of experimentation which now can be carried on only at the expense of the lives, individual liberty, and well-being of the American people. Many of these social gains cannot go on as usual. I hope these false philosophers have not become so saturated with their ideas of social gains that they are going to demand their continuation as against the defense interests of this country. Is it not time that we stopped this waste? I believe that it is, and that we should come down to earth and devote our total resources to the winning of this war.

As a matter of check-up, we have been a couple of years organizing what was supposed to be the great production machine of war, but when the time of need actually comes, where are the airplanes, tanks, guns, ships, and munitions?

The answer is that they were still on paper and not in the field. We did not start on this program yesterday, but have been voting large appropriations for a long time. Is it not possible, therefore, that all of these new departments and organizations, that were and are tremendously expensive to this Government, are using manpower and money that should be used for the production of airplanes, and so forth?

These false philosophers are still scheming for the maintenance of N. Y. A., C. C. C., and many of the other alphabetical groups that have far outlived the period of time in which they were useful. Why does this Government have to maintain thousands of employees, no doubt good employees, to run these departments, and take up the necessary space of those really necessary and important departments? Why cannot all these now unnecessary, now undesirable, and now unreasonable alphabetical departments be disbanded at once, and the personnel, equipment, and space be used for our all-out war effort?

We are going to have our hands full winning this war, and we cannot do it by running a three-ring circus, of which one ring, or one-third, would represent the war effort, as against the other two rings, or two-thirds, representing a lot of those socialistic experiments, those unnecessary functions of things that never should, in the first place, have become a part of Federal Government. The Federal Government would do well if it handled its own business, which today means winning this war, efficiently, and leave to the States and other governmental units

the handling of these matters that strictly belong to them.

There are many splendid employees in these departments who can, through their knowledge of governmental work, remove bottlenecks in the Government departments and speed up this program.

Our people are being greatly burdened with taxes which I believe they are willing to pay if they know the money is going directly into the war effort and not being frittered away in these frivolous, nonsensical operations.

There is nothing the matter with the morale of the American people. I think there is no nation on earth that can compare with the morale of the American people so long as they know that their Government is working really efficiently. If this Government will work really efficiently, at no time will it have to question the morale of the American people. This same group of American people today, with modern means of communication, are not going to be fooled. They are not even going to be fooled by the departmental publicity propagandists who deliver conversation and excuses instead of real performance. Why do we have to have all of this duplication of publicity departments? If these departments would actually deliver results, I am quite sure the regular channels of publicity will recognize that which they have done. Of course, if they do not propose to perform and deliver, then they may need departmental publicity bureaus to further try to fool the American people and continue to give excuses and reports instead of performance. They should be discontinued, together with their propaganda, and devote their efforts to real war production.

I cannot help but recall the days that many of us stood upon this floor and told Mr. Murray, Mr. Reuther, Mr. Hillman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bridges, Secretary of Labor Perkins, and others, when all these C. I. O. strikes were going on, that we would rue the day that they wasted millions of man-days in strikes against the slow defense program of this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This man Reuther is the same man that the administration was taking around in a plane when he was trying to give us some idea of what the Reuther plan was?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Exactly, and I refer to him down below.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says he refers to him down below?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes. I think he is in better position now to sabotage the program of this country than at any time before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is the one who with his brother went to Russia and sent back the message to fight for Soviet Russia?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes. He is the same one who advocated bloody revolution in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is also the one who received a deferment in Detroit from military service?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I am not aware of that, but I am sure he would if he could.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He would come under this last order that was issued and I think he got it before.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman made reference to the large number of publicity agents on the public pay roll. I understand there are 2,895 on the permanent Federal pay roll. The cost to the taxpayers is over \$27,000,000 a year. Their work is to simply start a black-out any time that they think it will be to their advantage to put over many of these socialistic schemes of theirs.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I believe that if these men really delivered results they would not have to have these outside propagandists. That is what they are. They are agencies to fool the American people into believing they are getting one thing when as a matter of fact they are giving us another.

Mr. REED of New York. I might add right there that according to the record there are over 30,000 part-time publicity agents on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I am glad to have that contribution. That day has arrived. Here is General MacArthur putting up the most gallant fight the world has ever seen, calling for a few airplanes that could not be delivered to him. There is the spectacle of the Australians, the Dutch, and the British losing Singapore, and many other strategic locations, because we did not and could not send airplanes.

Why could we not send these airplanes? The answer is, simply because the Hillmans, the Perkinses, the Lewises, the Murrays, the Reuthers, the Bridges, and many of that stripe, thought far more of the advancement of the interests of the C. I. O. racketeers than they did of the interests of this country.

We have the spectacle of Reuther wanting to dominate production with the Reuther plan before we were actually in the war. Now we have the spectacle of this same man threatening to strike now in time of war, against the defense program of these United States. How well fixed Reuther would have been to sabotage this whole program, more than he has, if he were permitted to put his plan into effect.

Is it not time that this administration recognize what these people have done to this country, how they have weakened it, and how, if their program is continued, it will destroy it? Still, we find these people occupying high places in the defense program, whose judgment has been proved to be unsound. Why are they not kicked out? Are they going to continue to place this program in jeopardy?

The time for splitting hairs is over, and the time for good sound judgment has come, regardless of whose toes are stepped upon. I believe the administration should take a strong stand and remove from Government these people who have been so wrong. Nothing better could be done which would create so much confidence and build up the morale of our people and give us the production that would insure winning this war.

This Government is shot through with these mealy mouthed, half-baked, socialistic, racketeering incompetents, who I believe are carrying on a war from within and who, by their actions, whether they mean to or not, have destroyed and are still destroying the ability of this country to furnish the airplanes, tanks, ships, munitions, and supplies that we need so badly right now.

Time after time I have called the attention of this House to how closely this Nation has paralleled the actions of France. France had its Murrays, Lewises, Bridges, Freytags, Hillmans, Reuthers, and others on the outside of their Cabinet. It also had its Perkinses, Hillmans, and others on the inside. Through connivance and cooperation, these two groups got together, and, regardless of what their intentions may have been, they destroyed France.

I am a friend of the President of the United States and a friend of the administration and the American people when I beg of them to see the light, to see the parallel, and not permit this group to destroy this country. This phase of our defense can no longer be overlooked. It may have been tolerated in the past, but to tolerate it any longer will be only to court our own downfall and ruin, as France was ruined.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, we are in the war; a war not of our own choosing but a war sponsored by the totalitarian countries who have been planning it for years. They have at last succeeded in their hearts' desires to engage us in this cruel and wicked and, I fear, bloody war. A war which has for its purpose the enslavement of most of the people of the earth; a war to make might the master of right. A war wherein and whereby smaller nations, without cause or provocation, have seen their flags hurled into the dust of centuries—their people enslaved and their property confiscated by the stronger nations. Yes; a war to crush civilization.

But since it was not our desire to engage in the cruelties of war it does not mean that we have not heard the cry of civilization; neither does it mean that we are going to sleep through the developing menace. While it is true that we were not prepared for war—principally because peace-loving people are never prepared for war—and since the cowardly, uncivilized, and treacherous acts perpetrated on us on December 7 we have suffered some set-backs and adversities which of course are hard for liberty-loving Americans to submit and reconcile themselves to.

Since I came to Congress, which was on the 3d of January 1941, common sense and common knowledge have given me a reasonably fair insight into the conditions of the world, and the dangers that

beset my country. I have been alarmed at the attitude of the American people for their lack of unity, which is so necessary always to the preservation of any people. During that time I have often refrained from saying the things I wanted to say and expressing my thoughts, because of my desire to bring about a unity of my people; and I was afraid that I might say something which would hinder instead of help.

On many occasions during uncalled-for strikes in defense industries and stoppages of the manufacture of vital and necessary material and equipment to our national defense and security, I have shuddered and grieved for the future welfare of my country and my people. I felt then, and I feel now, that there are many more ways of sabotage and of sabotaging other than being an alien. But waiting, hoping, and praying that Americans engaged in such acts would wake up and realize these wrongs—would turn from such courses—has caused me to bridle my tongue and not express views and thoughts which have come to me.

And then when the enormous profits of industry were being reported, as an American who loves his country I thought this condition should and would be righted without too much publicity being given them, and I refrained from expressing the thoughts that were in my heart. It occurred to me then, and it occurs to me now, is our American patriotism becoming so cheap, becoming so common that it must be bought with money? Does it take an increase in wages or an increase in profits to make the American people patriotic? I want to answer that question in the negative, for I hope not. I pray not. God forbid that such thoughts and conditions are in the hearts of any portion of the American people. I believe that if this Congress will give the American people proper leadership in these trying hours such conditions will never exist.

Mr. Speaker, with these thoughts in mind, my love for my country compels me to speak because we are in this war—a world war—a war of the greatest magnitude the world has ever known. A war that is going to take our best efforts, from every standpoint, to come out victorious; and I am grieved because it occurs to me that we are not awake to the true situation and the real dangers ahead for us. Not only are we unprepared with the necessary equipment but our actions are such that they will not bring about the unity which is so necessary and needed at this time.

Our financial structure is such that our national debt is three times as great as was the total cost of the war in 1917 and 1918, and we have just started. Strikes have not ceased but are continually occurring in defense industries. Clamors for higher wages are still raging and higher profits are still in demand. Congress is being called upon every week to raise the wages of Federal workers of all kinds, under the pretext that it is necessary because the cost of living has increased. The cry for more and increased appropriations of every kind and character is being heard, and in many instances it is for nonessentials, for things not necessary to our national de-

fense and security. Again I shudder and grieve over the outlook. To back up all our financial outlay it is necessary to raise the immediate and necessary funds by the sale of Defense stamps and bonds, which must eventually be paid by funds raised through taxation.

It has been said, and well said, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. The American people do not object to giving of their all when it is necessary in the protection of their liberty which has meant more to them than life itself. Neither do they object to giving their all for the preservation of civilization; but they do seriously object to giving of their lifeblood, sweat, and tears, when the burdens are not equalized. They do object to giving their all when certain other classes are given the advantage in the national defense program. When some grow richer and others make more, and clamor for more and more, they are prone, as true Americans, to become dissatisfied with the situation, and will, as Americans, demand the invoking of our American rule:

Equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Mr. Speaker, there was on the 21st day of January passed by this body, under the unanimous consent rule, H. R. 3487, which among other provisions, provided for elective and appointive Federal officers to come under the Civil Service Retirement Act, referred to by the newspapers and the people as pensions for Congressmen. This bill was not on the calendar for the day's business, but it was brought up after the regular business on the calendar had been completed. It was brought up at a time when, in my opinion, there were not over 20 Members on the floor of the House; brought up at a time when at least 400 Members of this House were not on the floor; and these Members had no idea that a measure with such provisions would be brought up.

I did not vote for this bill; I could not vote for such a bill. I have always been opposed to such principles. After I learned the next day that a bill with such provisions in it had got by the House, I hoped and believed that the President would veto it. Then, as the House adjourned over the weekend on Thursday, the 22d, I waited, and on Tuesday next, which was the 27th of the month, word came that the President had approved the bill. I was disappointed and I then took the floor of the House and voiced my sentiments against this bill. I stated then, and I state now, that this was one of the worst bills that ever got by an American Congress. I felt that way then; I feel that way now.

At that time I stated that if some other Member did not introduce a bill to repeal this vicious act, I would do so myself. I was immediately informed that before the President's ink, used in signing and approving this bill, had become dry, two bills had been introduced to repeal the same. I have since that time had the pleasure of signing a petition, petitioning the Civil Service Committee to bring out one of these bills on the floor of this House, and give the Members a chance to vote on it, an opportunity we have not had heretofore. This should be done. It should be done now, to show the peo-

ple of our country during these trying times, that it is not our desire to take from the Treasury money which is being paid in by the heavily burdened taxpayers. By so doing it will further show the American people that we are willing to lead in these trying hours.

I do not know what course other Members desire to take, but for me I want it said that I consider myself a servant of the people, and not an employee of the Government. To serve my people at any time is an honor to me. The fact that I am permitted to serve and represent them now during the darkest days that I have ever known—such service is compensation within itself.

Since the passing of this act I have listened closely to the arguments of the sponsors and the Members who favored this bill, and only a few arguments have been put forth in support of the same. After I have analyzed these arguments I am of the opinion that when fully considered it should not meet the approval of a single Member.

One of the first arguments is that all other Federal employees are under the Retirement Act, so then why should not Federal elective officers be included? I have partly answered that argument heretofore in saying that when I ran for the position I now hold I did not call it the position of an officer but I asked to be given the opportunity to serve my people; and I consider myself to be a servant of the people, trying to represent them in the greatest legislative body in the world.

My second answer is that the doctrine that one wrong will right another is false philosophy and cannot be adhered to. How many Members of this body do you think would have been elected by their constituents if they put in the platforms upon which they ran that they advocated the Federal Government putting up \$500 a year of the taxpayers' money to match the same amount put up by the Congressman for a retirement fund for himself? If anyone had been so foolish to have done so, you would have been able to count his votes by the number of fingers on his hands.

The next argument in support of this legislation is to the effect that soldiers and United States judges retire—soldiers on 75 percent pay and Federal judges on full pay. The soldiers are engaged in a hazardous occupation. It is through them that our country is protected and has been preserved. It was the actions of the soldiers that made our country; it was through the efforts of the soldiers that our country has been defended and preserved. In becoming a soldier you surrender your individual freedom and liberty. You surrender that which is dearer than life itself—all for the safety, preservation, and security of your people. In becoming a soldier you not only surrender your individual freedom and liberty but you put your life at stake for your country. When war comes the soldier is the one that is put on the firing line, and in so doing he risks his life for the preservation of the American people and our flag.

The American soldier is now being paid the sum of \$21 a month during this emergency, which is always less during peace-

time, when he gives the best of his life and serves the time required before he can retire. He has not had time to prepare himself for civilian life, and the little, insignificant amount he draws in salary does not give him an opportunity to accumulate any wealth. A gracious people will never object, but consider it an honor and a privilege to protect him in his hour of need; and it does not comport to sound logic and common sense to compare a soldier with Congressmen in justification of retirement pay.

While it is true that Federal judges are retired on full pay after serving a required length of time, I say to you that this is not right. On the contrary, it is wrong. Some day—and I hope not too far distant—the American people will right this wrong. I do not object to paying a Federal judge a pension on retirement if it is necessary to do so, but at the retirement age they have reached the evening of life's stage; and certainly they cannot and will not, judicially, spend their whole salaries. It resolves itself down to this point: Retired Federal judges are being paid taxpayers' money, all of which is not necessary for a common living, and means that the part not necessary to the support of the retired judge will be accumulated as an estate to be handed down to his heirs. This is unjust and unfair to the taxpaying citizens. It is inequitable and should be stopped.

The last argument in favor of the Retirement Act for Congressmen is that it will make them independent so that they will not be afraid to cast their votes because of political pressure, and the country would receive better representation. This is also the argument usually given in support of retirement for Federal judges; and to me, when it is fully analyzed, is an indictment of the honesty, integrity, and patriotism of every Member of Congress and every Federal judge. To me it rings with unexpressed words * * * "For money you will be honest; for money you will vote your convictions; for money you will make a better, independent Representative—money that you did not know of when you went before your people and asked them for the privilege of serving them; money that you did not count upon when you accepted the responsibilities and honors of representing those who sent you here." It is an implication that your honesty and integrity are for sale.

I refute such implications and say that I believe the Members of this House are the salt of the earth, and that their honesty and integrity are not for sale at any price. I believe they are ready and willing to do their duty and wipe this wrongful and untimely act off the face of the statute books. And in so doing we will be keeping faith with those who sent us here, those who sent us here to serve them and our Nation, not solely for compensation but for the privilege of upholding our country in this dark hour and its freedom, which is the bulwark of civilization; for the purpose of promoting the general welfare of our people, and, my colleagues, we must not aid in the destruction of that freedom by unnecessarily making the tax burden harder. Neither should we ignore the appeals of

the taxpayers all over our land by piling up unnecessary debts in continuing non-defense spending.

There has been, along with the beautiful history of our country two Connecticut men presented to the youth of the land and to the American people. One of these men was a mere youth whose name has made the bosom of every American youth swell with pride and made him feel happy because he was an American. His name has always thrilled every American. While the other for a time he'd some of the highest positions of the land, a man who was respected by the elite of the country, who graced the highest society, yet when darkness and gloom began to settle over our fair land, when the dark hour in our early country's history was hovering over the American Continent, while he was in a responsible position, a position to render a faithful service—or, on the other hand, a position to do harm at a time when faithful service was needed more than ever—he sold his honor; he sold his integrity—he attempted to sell his country for 30 pieces of money. Of course, these pieces were larger than the terrible 30 pieces recorded in the Book of Books. In this sale I wonder if he wanted to be independent. Everyone knows I speak of Benedict Arnold, the traitor.

On the other hand, the other Connecticut boy—and I call him a boy because he was a mere youth—in the dark and trying hours of our country's history and at a time when his services were needed by his country, his Commander in Chief needed certain information. This Connecticut boy, in the face of almost certain death, smilingly volunteered his services. You know the story—he was captured by the enemy. And when he stood before his executioners and they asked him if he had anything to say before he was executed, he expressed his regrets that he had only one life to give to his suffering and bleeding country. Everyone understands that I speak of Nathan Hale, the immortal boy from Connecticut.

I want to uphold to America the patriotism of Nathan Hale. I want America to remember him today, tomorrow, and forever; but I want Benedict Arnold and his 30 pieces of money wiped from America's history.

The act of Congress in passing the Retirement Act for Congressmen has been a large factor in destroying the unity that we need so badly at this time. Of course, it has been camouflaged and demagogued by stretching the imagination of the individual. This is no justification, however, for the unrighteous act; and, as I stated, I could not support any such legislation. I want this House to know that demagogues are using this unrighteous act to snipe men who are doing their utmost to carry on for the sake of America in these trying hours.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for pensions for Congressmen. This is no time for waste and extravagance. This is no time for increases in wages and it is no time for increases in profits. This is no time for strikes and shut-downs in defense industries; for such at this dark hour in our American history is no less than treason, and those who are respon-

sible should be punished accordingly. This is no time for shorter hours and increases in pay. It is no time for time and a half for over 40 hours a week. Our Nation's very existence is at stake in the bitterest and costliest war we have ever engaged in.

To win this war it is going to take the best efforts of all the American people, and Congressmen are no exception to the rule; but, on the other hand, they stand in a position to lead the way. I hope we forget ourselves and everything else except the welfare of our country, and do only the things that will lead the American people in the right path.

The best soldier is the one who has no interest in self, who goes into battle without thinking about himself, but with a desire in his heart to do the things and do them now which will help his company and his country. He does not ask himself, "If I should do this will I receive political preference?"; or "Will this be a good vote getter?" No. The real soldier does not do that. His thoughts are with his country. He feels that he must do his best in order that his country, his comrades, may survive. With American determination he grits his teeth in firm resolution, plunges forward with only one thought, which is exemplified in the words, "Yes, for America, I will."

Such an example of Americanism I commend to this Congress. I commend it to all the people of my country, and trust and hope that we have the courage in this dangerous hour to the American way of life to henceforth resolve without murmur to give of our very best without thought of our own selfish interests; without thought of our future fortunes; without thought of our political futures—to America—in order that she may gloriously survive.

I believe we should go the Nathan Hale way and give everything now to the cause we are engaged in, and forget that money to us as individuals plays any part in it. Money is a means of exchange, but it cannot buy patriotism. It cannot buy love of country; it cannot buy a willingness to shed the blood that flows in our American veins for the country we love. Let us resolve to do our part to help keep our beautiful land free and independent; free from all hidden purposes; from those who desire to destroy the integrity, the honesty, the beauty, of American ideals handed down to us by generations of Americans who fought for them, died for them; and who gave us the heritage to carry on. Let our answer be, "Yes, for America we will; God helping us, we can do no other."

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. May I compliment the gentleman on making a very splendid address. I also should like to vote for the repeal of this pension plan. I understand that the Committee on the Civil Service had a meeting this morning to consider such a repeal bill. I am wondering if the gentleman knows when that bill will come before the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. In answer to

his inquiry, I may say that I do not know when the bill will come before the House, but I hope it will be soon because nothing has stirred up the average citizen—the average taxpayer throughout the United States—more than this iniquitous act.

Mr. ROLPH. I agree with the gentleman, and sincerely hope that the bill comes before the House very soon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, indefinitely, to Mr. OSMERS.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution amending section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 23, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, February 20, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 6156—land-grant rates with respect to Government traffic.

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, February 25, 1942.

Business to be considered: To resume hearings on petroleum as outlined in Mr. COLE's memorandum of February 6, 1942.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday, February 25, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., for the continuation of hearings on S. 1476 (Florida tick bill).

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON H. R. 6503

This will advise you that the hearings previously scheduled for Tuesday, February 17, 1942, at 10 a. m., have been postponed until Thursday, February 26, 1942, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 6503, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1414. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1415. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize

the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1416. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1417. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend subsection 11 (b) of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1418. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment, administration, and maintenance of a Coast Guard Auxiliary and a Coast Guard Reserve," approved February 19, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 1782. An act to authorize the payment of a donation to and to provide for the travel at Government expense of persons discharged from the Army of the United States on account of fraudulent enlistment (Rept. No. 1800). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 1891. An act to amend an act to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army so as to provide uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Army of the United States (Rept. No. 1801). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2249. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy, additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6470. A bill to extend the time within which the amount of any national marketing quota for tobacco, proclaimed under section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, may be increased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6625. A bill granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910; without amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6543. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the production of alcohol; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 6633. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 6634. A bill to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6635. A bill making the theft of tires and tubes a Federal offense during any period in which restrictions on the sale or use of tires or tubes are in effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 6636. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making elective officers ineligible to receive annuity benefits under such act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 6637. A bill to provide for payment of a clothing allowance to enlisted personnel of the United States Naval Reserve, and certain enlisted men of the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6638. A bill for the relief of dependents of civilians who were engaged by civilian contractors on the islands of Wake and Guam; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 6639. A bill to provide temporary relief to labor becoming displaced by reason of the emergency created by the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6640. A bill to provide temporary relief to labor becoming displaced by reason of the emergency created by the war; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2454. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Massachusetts School Work Advisory Board, favoring the continuation of the National Youth Administration school work program and the allocation of funds sufficient to assure its effective operation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2455. Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the continuance of the special committee of Congress to investigate un-American activities, popularly known as the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

2456. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23, of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress to provide for the prompt completion of the All-American Canal to the Coachella Valley; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2457. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of the House of Representatives of Mississippi endorsing bundles for Congress, and opposing retirement benefits or pensions for Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2458. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Reclamation Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to sundry subjects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2459. Also, petition of the United Packing House Workers, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to unemployment compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.